NATIONAL ARCHIVES MICROFILM PUBLICATIONS

MICROCOPY
215
ROLL
30

NATIONAL ARCHIVES MICROFILM PUBLICATIONS

Microcopy No. 215

MINUTES OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Roll 30

October 3, 1921 - June 9, 1924

THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES
NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Washington: 1954

NOTES ON ROLL 30

The three volumes reproduced on this roll have the following backstrip titles: (1) "Minutes / 1921 / Supreme Court / of the / United States"; (2) "Minutes / 1922 / Supreme Court / of the / United States"; and (3) "Minutes / 1923 / Supreme Court / of the / United States." They contain the minutes of the Supreme Court of the United States from October 3, 1921, to June 9, 1924.

The first volume contains the minutes of the Court from October 3, 1921, to June 5, 1922; the second, from October 2, 1922, to June 11, 1923; and the third, from October 1, 1923, to June 9, 1924.

VOLUME

1921

At the Capitol of the United States, in the City of Washington, and District of Columbia, being the present seat of the National Government of the United States, on the first Monday of October (being the 3rd day of the same month) in the year of our Lord one thousand, nine hundred and twenty-one and of the Independence of the United States the one hundred and forty-sixth, the Supreme Court of the United States met agreeably to law.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis VanDevanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George F. Wells, it is ordered that William Paul Allen, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. O. Murfin, it is ordered that James V. Oxtoby, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Attorney General Daugherty, it is ordered that James N. Linton, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio; Mabel Walker Willebrandt of Los Angeles, State of California; Albert Ottinger, Esquire, and John W. H. Crim, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Knute Nelson, it is ordered that Ripley B. Brower, Esquire, of St. Cloud, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hollins N. Randolph, it is ordered that George E. Walker, Esquire, and Thomas Jefferson Randolph, Esquire, of Charlottesville, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Borah, it is ordered that W. L. Dunn, Esquire, of Oakley, State of Idaho, and John C. Sullivan, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Daniel Davenport, it is ordered that W. H. Comley, Esquire, of Bridgeport, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Julian S. Jones, it is ordered that J. Wallace Bryan, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hoke Smith, it is ordered that Mary Campbell Johnson of Rome, and William C. Lankford, Esquire, of Douglas, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. T. Milans, it is ordered that Ralph Munden, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank S. Bright, it is ordered that H. Stanley Hinrichs, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Patrick H. Kelley, it is ordered that Glenn C. Gillespie, Esquire, of Pontiac, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George W. Wickersham, it is ordered that Walbridge S. Taft, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl R. Chindblom, it is ordered that Ransom E. Walker, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt, it is ordered that Joseph C. Slaughter, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward E. Blodgett, it is ordered that T. Catesby Jones, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Atlee Pomerene, it is ordered that John L. Cable, Esquire, of Lima, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry E. Davis, it is ordered that William R. Wilder, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. W. Harreld, it is ordered that Rufus P. Roope, Esquire, of Chandler, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ross A. Collins, it is ordered that Edward L. Craig, Esquire, of Columbia, State of South Carolina; Neil T. Currie, Esqaire, of Hattiesburg, and J. W. Cassedy, Esquire, of Brookhaven, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Victor E. Keyes, it is ordered that George H. Shaw, Esquire, and Paul W. Lee, Esquire, of Fort Collins, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Humphrey, it is ordered that Carl J. Skinner, Esquire, of Clinton, State of Iowa, and Walter F. Meier, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Reeves T. Strickland, it is ordered that William A. Davidson, Esquire, of Port Chester, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Andrew B. Duvall, it is ordered that Burt W. Henry, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Mr. Justice McKenna said:

"GENTLEMEN OF THE BAR: Since the last adjournment of the court, the President has appointed William Howard Taft Chief Justice of the United States. His commission has been received, and the clerk will read it."

The clerk then read the commission, and immediately thereafter the oath of office was administered by Mr. Justice McKenna, and Mr. Chief Justice Taft took the seat of the Chief Justice.

Which said commission and oath are in the following words and figures, viz:

"WARREN G. HARDING

PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

To all who shall see these Presents, Greeting:

KNOW YE; That reposing special trust and confidence in the wisdom, uprightness and learning of WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT, of Connecticut, I have nominated and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, do appoint him to be Chief Justice of the United States, and do authorize and empower him to execute and fulfil the duties of that office according to the Constitution and laws of the said United States, and to have and to hold the said office, with all the powers, privileges and emoluments to the same of right appertaining, unto him the said William Howard Taft, during his good behavior.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have caused these letters to be made patent and the seal of the Department of Justice to be hereunto affixed.

S E A L.

Given under my hand, in the District of Columbia, the 30th day of June, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and twenty one, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty fifth.

WARREN G. HARDING

By the President:

H. M. DAUGHERTY,

Attorney General."

"SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON.

October Term, 1921.

I, WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT, do solemnly swear that I will administer justice without respect to persons, and do equal right to the poor and to the rich, and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all of the duties incumbent upon me as Chief Justice of the United States according to the best of my abilities and understanding, agreeably to the Constitution and Laws of the United States. So help me God.

Wm. H. TAFT.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 3rd day of October, A. D. 1921.

JOSEPH McKENNA,

Asso. Justice."

Mr. Attorney General Daugherty presented Mr. James M. Beck, of New Jersey, as Solicitor General of the United States, and it was ordered that his commission be recorded.

Which said commission is in the following words and figures, viz.:

"WARREN G. HARDING

PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

To all who shall see these Presents, Greeting:

Know Ye; That reposing special trust and confidence in the wisdom, uprightness and learning of JAMES M. BECK, of New Jersey, I have nominated and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, do appoint him to be Solicitor General, and do authorize and empower him to execute and fulfil the duties of that office according to the Constitution and Laws of the said United States, and to have and to hold the said office, with all the powers, privileges and emoluments to the same of right appertaining, unto him the said James M. Beck.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have caused these letters to be made patent and the seal of the Department of Justice to be hereunto affixed.

Given under my hand in the District of Columbia, the 21st day of June, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and twenty one, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty fifth.

S E A L.

WARREN G. HARDING.

By the President:

H. M. DAUGHERTY,

Attorney General."

The Chief Justice announced that all motions noticed for today will be heard tomorrow, and the Court will then commence the call of the docket pursuant to the twenty sixth rule.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, October 4th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred L. Fishback, it is ordered that James F. Brady, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Bryce Baskin, it is ordered that Harry E. Tincher, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elijah M. Zoline, it is ordered that John J. Curtin, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George M. Caster, it is ordered that Joseph R. Cash, Esquire, of Bonesteel, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Daniel Thew Wright, it is ordered that Harry H. Hollander, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. L. McNary, it is ordered that W. P. Magill, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. P. Freeling, it is ordered that Phil D. Brewer, Esquire, and Paul Reiss, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E. Walker, it is ordered that W. Gilmer Dunn, Esquire, of Charlottesville, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank K. Nebeker, it is ordered that Samuel Russell, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, in the State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice said:

"Mr. Maher, the clerk of this court, in whose name the office has been administered since his death, died just at the adjournment of court, so that no successor was appointed.

"The office continued in his name under the statute, by his deputy, H. C. McKenney. During the summer Mr. McKenney died, and the administration of the office was continued by the acting deputy, William R. Stansbury.

"The court has now appointed William R. Stansbury to be clerk of the court. He will qualify by giving the bond required and taking the oath."

ORDER.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT WILLIAM RILEY STANSBURY be appointed Clerk of this Court in the place of JAMES D. MAHER, deceased, and that he forthwith take the oath of office and give bond conditioned according to law.

Which said oath and bond are in the following words and figures, viz.:

"I, WILLIAM R. STANSBURY, being appointed Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States, do solemnly swear that I will truly and faithfully enter and record all the orders, decrees, judgments and proceedings of the said Court and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all the duties of my said office, according to the best of my abilities and understanding. So help me God.

WM. R. STANSBURY.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 5th day of October, A. D. 1921.

WM. H. TAFT,

Chief Justice of the United States."

"KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS,

That we, WM. R. STANSBURY, as principal, and the AETNA CASUALTY & SURETY COMPANY, as surety, are held and firmly bound unto the United States of America in the penal sum of TWENTY THOUSAND DOLLARS ($20,000.00, lawful money of the United States, to be paid to the said United States of America or their certain attorney, to which payment, well and truly to be made, we bind ourselves, our and each of our heirs, executors, administrators and assigns, jointly and severally, firmly by these presents.

Sealed with our seals and dated this 4th day of October, A.D.1921.

WHEREAS, the above bounden WM. R. STANSBURY hath been appointed Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States,

NOW, THEREFORE, the condition of the above obligation is such that if he, the said WM. R. STANSBURY, shall faithfully discharge the duties of his said office, and seasonably record the decrees, judgments and determinations of the said Supreme Court of the United States, then this obligation to be void, otherwise, to remain in full force and virtue in law.

WM. R. STANSBURY (Seal)

Signed, sealed and delivered
in the presence of:
C. KILMORE CROPLEY,
M. L. LEWIS.

THE AETNA CASUALTY & SURETY COMPANY
BY J. T. Jones, (Seal)
Attorney in Fact.

(Thirty-five cents in revenue stamps canceled)

Approved October 5th, 1921, by order of the Court.

WM. H. TAFT,

Chief Justice of the United States."

The State of Texas,
Complainant,
24, Original. vs.
The Interstate Commerce Commission et al.

The motion on behalf of the Railroad Labor Board to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf.

The United States, Appellant,
67. vs.
Henry W. Volk, as Trustee, etc.

It is ordered that the appeal to this Court heretofore made by the United States be held in abeyance, on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellant.

Chanslor-Canfield Midway Oil Company et al., Appellants,
162. vs.
The United States of America.

The joint motion to remand with instructions, etc., herein, was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
256. vs.
The Western Union Telegraph Company.

The motion for an extension of time within which to file supplemental briefs was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellant.

The Territory of Alaska et al.,
Appellants,
392. vs.
John W. Troy, Collector of Customs for the District of Alaska.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellants.

Tuesday, October 4th, 1921.

John D. Rockefeller,
Plaintiff in Error,
535 vs.
The United States of America.
and
The New York Trust Company
et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
536 vs.
William H. Edwards, Collector, etc.

It is ordered that these cases be advanced, to be heard with No. 260, on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the defendants in error.

United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, Petitioner,
355 vs.
John E. Sullivan.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner.

United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, etc., Petitioner,
526 vs.
Roger B. Wood, Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Guy D. Goff, and Mr. Abram F. Myers for the petitioner, and by Mr. Godfrey Goldmark for the respondent.

Oregon Eilers Music House, Petitioner,
508 vs.
H. W. Sitton, as trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Will R. King, Mr. Thomas Mannix, and Mr. C. A. A. McGee for the petitioner, and by Mr. William C. Bristol for the respondent.

Oregon Eilers Music House, Petitioner,
509 vs.
H. W. Sitton, as Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Will R. King, Mr. Thomas Mannix, and Mr. C. A. McGee for the petitioner, and by Mr. William C. Bristol for the respondent.

Ex Parte: In the Matter of Oregon Eilers Music House, ____, Original. Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of prohibition herein was submitted by Mr. Will R. King, Mr. Thomas Mannix, and Mr. C. A. McGee for the petitioner in support of the motion, and by Mr. Levi Cooke and Mr. William C. Bristol for the respondent in opposition thereto.

William H. Bryan, Appellant,
428 vs.
Joshua W. Miles, Collector, etc.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Julian S.Jones and Mr. Elliott W. Major for the appellant.

John Armstrong Chaloner,
Plaintiff in Error,
54 vs.
W. Gilmer Dunn.

The motion for injunction and motion that injunction remain in force until the hearing of the case on its merits were submitted by Mr. Hollins N. Randolph for the plaintiff in error. The motion to quash injunction and motion to dismiss the writ of error were submitted by Mr. W. Gwynn Gardiner for the defendant in error with leave to counsel for the plaintiff in error to file a reply.

Globe & Rutgers Fire Insurance Company, Petitioner,
477 vs.
Walker D. Hines, as Agent, etc.

Leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae, on motion of Mr. C. I. Clarke in that behalf.

The State of North Dakota,
Complainant,
12, Original. vs.
The State of Minnesota.
and
The State of South Dakota,
Complainant,
13, Original. vs.
The State of Minnesota.

A motion to consolidate these cases was submitted by Mr. Montreville J. Brown for the defendant.

The State of North Dakota ex rel.
William Lemke, Attorney General,
Complainant,
25,Original. vs.
Chicago & North Western Railway Company et al.

The motion for leave to file a motion to dismiss was submitted by Mr. Willard Saulsbury for the defendant.

The State of Texas, Complainant,
24,Original. vs.
The Interstate Commerce Commission

The motion for leave to file a motion to dismiss on behalf of the Interstate Commerce Commission was submitted by

Commerce Commission.

Louisiana Railway & Navigation Company, Plaintiff in Error,
353 vs.
R. E. Williams.

The motion to dismiss or affirm was submitted by Mr. S. P. Jones for the defendant in error in support of the motion.

John H. Martens et al., Petitioners,
409 vs.
Twin Falls-Oakley Land & Water Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Frank E. Noboker for the petitioners, and by Mr. James H. Richards and Mr. Oliver O. Haga for the respondent.

Ward & Gow, Plaintiff in Error,
343 vs.
Himan Krinskry et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. W. W. Chambers in that behalf.

John William Henry, Petitioner,
444 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Daniel Thew Wright for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Roy C. McHenry for the respondent.

John Ewen, Petitioner,
348 vs.
American Fidelity Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Henry E. Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Abram I. Elkus for the respondent.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Complainant,
17, Original. vs.
The State of West Virginia.
and
The State of Ohio, Complainant,
18, Original. vs.
The State of West Virginia.

The report of the commissioner herein was filed on motion of Mr. Levi Cooke in that behalf.

The State of New Mexico, Complainant,
19, Original. vs.
The State of Colorado.

The motion to strike out parts of the answer was submitted by Mr. Jay Turley in behalf of Mr. Frank W. Clancy for the complainant.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants,
257 vs.
Consolidated Gas Company of New York.
Consolidated Gas Company of New York, Appellant,
258 vs.
Charles D. Newton, Attorney General, etc., et al.
and
Consolidated Gas Company of New York, Appellant,
288 vs.
Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al.

The motion to consolidate these causes and to reassign them for argument was submitted by Mr. John A. Garver for the appellees, and by Mr. W. W. Chambers for the appellants.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants,
295 vs.
The Kings County Lighting Company.

The motion to reassign this cause for argument was submitted by Mr. John A. Garver for the appellee, and by Mr. W. W. Chambers for the appellants.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants,
296 vs.
New York & Queens Gas Company.

The motion to reassign this cause for argument was submitted by Mr. John A. Garver for the appellee, and by Mr. W.W. Chambers for the appellants.

Fred L. Lezinsky et al., Petitioners,
387 vs.
Mason Malt Whiskey Distilling Company, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Oscar W. Lange, in behalf of Mr. Percy V. Long, Mr. Theodore A. Bell, and Mr. William Sea, Jr., for the petitioners, and by Mr. George J. Hatfield for the respondents.

Henry Conlin, Petitioner,
520 vs.
Emma Rose et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins, Mr. Charles W. Cobb, and Mr. Edgar C. Chapman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Garret W. McEnerney for the respondents.

Luella Swartwood, as sole Administratrix, etc., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Lehigh Valley Railroad Company.

This cause was passed per stipulation of counsel to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26, on motion of Mr. Jesse C. Adkins in that behalf.

6.

Ex Parte: In the Matter of Mary Ellen Bain, Petitioner. --- Original.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted by Mr. Samuel Russell for the petitioner. Leave was granted Mr. Assistant Attorney General Nebeker to file brief in opposition thereto within five days.

The American Railway Express Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Commonwealth of Kentucky.

The motion for a writ of certiorari on suggestion of diminution of the record herein was submitted to the Court by Mr. Charles W. Stockton for the petitioner.

324

Colonial Beach Company, owner, etc., Petitioner, vs. Quemahoning Coal Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Hugh H. Obear and Mr. Paul Dulaney for the petitioner.

388

Union Trust Company of San Francisco et al., executors, etc., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Justus S. Wardell, U. S. Collector, etc., et al. and Harriet L. Levy et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Justus S. Wardell, U. S. Collector, etc., et al.

The motion to advance these causes was submitted by Mr. E. S. Heller, Mr. Edward F. Treadwell, and Mr. Garret W. McEnerney for the plaintiffs in error.

236

303

P. E. Hunter, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Wade H. Ellis and Mr. Challen B. Ellis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Stewart and Mr. Hugh A. Fisher for the respondent.

316

Southern Pacific Company, Petitioner,
529 vs.
Industrial Accident Commission of California et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Charles H. Bates, Mr. Henley C. Booth, and Mr. W. F. Herrin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Warren H. Pillsbury for the respondents.

Frank H. Hereford, Petitioner,
371 vs.
Edwin A. Meserve.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Charles H. Bates and Mr. John H. Campbell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Paul H. McPherrin for the respondent.

Cornelia G. Goodrich et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
158 vs.
West Lumber Company.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted by Mr. Charles H. Bates in behalf of counsel for the defendant in error in support of the motion.

Galveston Electric Company, Appellant,
455 vs.
City of Galveston et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. William E. Tucker for the appellant.

F. A. Gillespie, Plaintiff in Error,
322 vs.
The State of Oklahoma.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. S. P. Freeling in that behalf.

The State of Wyoming, Complainant,
3, Original. vs.
The State of Colorado.

The motion to set this case for hearing and as to filing briefs was submitted by Mr. Victor E. Keyes for the defendant.

Adelbert A. Weiland, as State Engineer, etc., et al., Appellants,
3. vs.
The Pioneer Irrigation Company.

This cause was passed, to be heard immediately following No. 3, Original, on motion of Mr. Victor E. Keyes for the appellants.

The State of New Mexico, Complainant,
19, Original. vs.
The State of Colorado.

The motion for leave to make oral argument on complainant's motion to strike out parts of the answer was submitted by Mr. Victor E. Keyes for the defendant.

The State of New Mexico, Complainant,
19, Original. vs.

Leave was granted counsel for the complainant to file additional brief within 60 days.

The State of New York et al., Appellants, 283 vs. The United States et al.

The motion to reassign this case for argument was submitted by Mr. A. P. Thom in behalf of the railroad companies.

The State of Texas, Complainant, 24, Original. vs. The Interstate Commerce Commission et al.

The motion for leave to file brief herein as amici curiae and to make oral argument was submitted by Mr. A. P. Thom in behalf of certain railroad companies.

Western Union Telegraph Company, Plaintiff in Error, 259 vs. Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt for the defendant in error.

William R. Bogg et al., Receivers, Appellants, 39 vs. The City of New York et al.

This cause was passed temporarily per stipulation of counsel, and on motion of Mr. Frederic D. McKenney in that behalf.

Wabash Railway Company, Petitioner, 461 vs. Henry D. Stewart.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney in behalf of Mr. John Lee Webster for the petitioner.

Landis Tool Company et al., Petitioners, 483 vs. Arthur H. Ingle.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney and Mr. E. W. Bradford for the petitioners, and by Mr. Clyde L. Rogers for the respondent.

The Central Railroad Company of New Jersey et al., Appellants, 436 vs. The United States of America et al.

The motion for an order temporarily suspending the operation of the order of the Interstate Commerce Commission was submitted by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, in behalf of Mr. Henry Wolf Bikle, Mr. Charles E. Miller and Mr. Alexander H. Elder for the appellants in support of the motion, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the appellees in opposition thereto.

The Central Railroad Company of New Jersey et al., Appellants,
436 vs.
The United States of America et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney in behalf of Henry Wolf Bikle, Mr. Charles E. Miller and Mr. Alexander H. Elder for the appellants, and by Mr. P. J. Farrell and Mr. Walter McFarland for the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The State of North Dakota ex rel. William Lemke, Attorney General, Complainant,
25, Original. vs.
Chicago & North Western Railway Company et al.

The motion for leave to further amend the original bill herein and the motion for an interlocutory injunction herein were submitted by Mr. Karl Knox Gartner for the complainant.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
20, Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

The motion in behalf of Placer Mining Association for certain relief in respect to the administration by the receiver herein was submitted by Mr. Thomas P. Gore in that behalf.

Railroad Commission of Wisconsin et al., Appellants,
206 vs.
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company.

The motion for leave to file brief herein as amicus curiae was submitted by Mr. John E. Benton in that behalf.

The State of Ohio ex rel. Allen J. Seney, Prosecuting Attorney, etc., Appellant,
300 vs.
Swift & Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Charles S. Northup for the appellant in support of the petition, and by Mr. Harold W. Fraser for the appellee in opposition thereto.

Dharandas Tulsidas et al., Petitioners,
314 vs.
The Insular Collector of Customs.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Adam C. Carson for the petitioners, and by Mr. Grant T. Trent and Mr. Logan H. Rock for the respondent.

The Upjohn Company, Petitioner,
320 vs.
The William S. Merrell Chemical

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Fred L. Chappell for the petitioner, and by Mr.

James C. Davis, Director General, Plaintiff in Error,
327 vs.
J. J. Smith, Jr., Administrator, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. H. O'B. Cooper, Mr. J. Blanc Monroe, Mr. Monte M. Lemann, Mr. A. S. Bozeman, Mr. S. R. Prince, and Mr. L. E. Jeffries for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition.

Garfield Priolean, Petitioner,
331 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Jacob Moorer and Mr. Joseph H. Stewart for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Roy C. McHenry for respondent.

Kissel Motor Car Company, Petitioner,
337 vs.
T. L. Walker et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Samuel B. Dabney for the petitioner.

J. K. Armsby Company, Petitioner,
341 vs.
Steamship "Esrom", her engines, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. D. Roger Englar for the petitioner, and by Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper for the respondent.

Oliver J. Olson, Owner, et al., Petitioners,
342 vs.
Charles F. Adams et al., Trustees, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Leon T. Seawell for the petitioners, and by Mr. Edward E. Blodgett, Mr. Floyd Hughes, and Mr. Albert T. Gould for the respondents.

First National Bank of Philadelphia, Petitioner,
349 vs.
J. Walter Farrell et al., etc.,
and
J. Walter Farrell et al., etc., Petitioners,
419 vs.
First National Bank of Philadelphia.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein were submitted by Mr. Joseph S. Clark and Mr. Owen J. Roberts for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry A. Rubino for the respondent, in No. 349; and by Mr. Henry A. Rubino for the petitioners, and by Mr. Joseph S. Clark and Mr. Owen J. Roberts for the respondent in No. 419.

Sidney S. McConnell, as Receiver, etc., Petitioner,
351 vs.
Walter C. Hubbard et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Archibald R. Watson, Mr. Luke E. Wright and Mr. Frank M. Thompson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward H. Blanc and Mr. Henry Craft for the respondents.

Salvatore Lauria, Petitioner,
354 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Ormond Simkins for the petitioner.

Panhandle Grain & Elevator Company, Petitioner,
360 vs.
Cromwell Brothers.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. W. F. Wilson for the petitioner, and by Mr. John W. Scothorn for the respondent.

Morse Dry Dock & Repair Company, Petitioner,
361 vs.
Steamship "Lord Alexis", her engines, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Pierre M. Brown for the petitioner, and by Mr. Chauncey I. Clark for the respondent.

William J. Crittenden, Petitioner,
375 vs.
Dora Widrevitz, as administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. A. Gordon Murray for the petitioner, and by Mr. Tobias A. Keppler for the respondent.

Minnesota Commercial Men's Association, Petitioner,
379 vs.
Minnie Mae Benn, as Executrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. David F. Simpson, Mr. A. V. Ricks, and Mr. William A. Lancaster for the petitioner.

Charles McKelvey et al., Petitioners,
382 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Ralph W. Adair for the petitioners, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Riter and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Underwood for the respondent.

Erie Railroad Company, Petitioner,
384 vs.
Ida Cott, as Administratrix, etc.; and

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein were submitted by Mr. John W. Ryan

Erie Railroad Company, as Lessee, etc., et al., Petitioners, 385 vs. Ida Cott, as Administratrix, etc.	for the petitioner in No. 384, by Mr. Lyman M. Bass for the petitioner in No. 385, and by Mr. Hamilton Ward for the respondent.
Regal Drug Corporation, Petitioner, 386 vs. Justus S. Wardell, as U. S. Collector, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John W. Preston for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the respondent.
The New York Central and Hudson River Railroad Company, Petitioner, 391 vs. John W. Kinney.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Maurice C. Spratt for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hamilton Ward for the respondent.
Ed. Slocum, as Trustee, etc. Petitioner, 400 vs. Anna Halliday et al., etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Charles J. Pretzman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Smith W. Bennett for the respondents.
Harry Lefkowitz et al., Petitioners, 404 vs. The United States of America.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John J. Curtin, Mr. Herbert C. Smyth, and Mr. Elijah N. Zoline for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondents.
American Mills Company, Petitioner, 405 vs. American Surety Company of New York.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Henry Uttal for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry C. Willcox for the respondent.
Verde Water and Power Company, Petitioner, 412 vs. Salt River Valley Water	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Alexander Britton and Mr. Francis W. Clements for the petitioners, and by Mr. J. L. B. Alexander and Mr. George D. Christ for the respondent.

Strick Line, Ltd., as Owner, etc., Petitioner, 414 vs. A. Suna, Master, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William H. McGrann and Mr. John M. Woolsey for the petitioner, and by Mr. George Forbes for the respondent.
City of Dallas et al., Petitioners, 415 vs. Dallas Telephone Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. James J. Collins for the petitioners, and by Mr. Henry C. Coke, Mr. D. A. Frank, and Mr. J. D. Frank for the respondent.
Philadelphia and Reading Railway Company, Petitioner, 421 vs. Carl A. Berg.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William Clarke Mason for the petitioner, and by Mr. Silas B. Axtell and Mr. Warren Bigelow for the respondent.
Catherine Ryan, Petitioner, 425 vs. Aetna Life Insurance Company of Hartford, Connecticut.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Thomas J. O'Neill for the petitioner, and by Mr. John Vernou Bouvier, Jr., for the respondent.
Champlain Realty Company, Petitioner, 426 vs. Town of Brattleboro.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William C. Cannon for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ernest W. Gibson for the respondent.
Osaka Shosen Kaisha et al., Petitioners, 427 vs. Pacific Export Lumber Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William H. Hayden for the petitioner.
Guayaquil & Quito Railroad Company, Petitioner, 430 vs. New York and Cuba Mail Steamship Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John Thomas Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper for the respondent.
Frederick M. Kilmer, Trustee, etc.,	

431 vs. Charles H. Keith, Trustee, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Elbridge R. Anderson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lee M. Freidman and Mr. Percy A. Atherton for the respondent.
Director General of Railroads, Petitioner, 433 vs. Helen Buschalewski, as Administratrix, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Maurice C. Spratt for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hamilton Ward for the respondent.
Pang Hing, Petitioner, 438 vs. Edward White, Commissioner of Immigration, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston and Mr. George W. Hott for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.
James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, etc. Petitioner, 439 vs. Mrs. Maude E. Green, Administratrix, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. B. E. Eaton and Mr. T. J. Wills for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. W. Cassedy for the respondent.
Grinnell Overland Company, Petitioner, 440 vs. Merchants National Bank et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Liston McMillen for the petitioner.
James J. O'Brien, Petitioner, 441 vs. Walter B. Lashar et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. James J. O'Brien, p.p., and by Mr. Arthur M. Marsh and Mr. William H. O'Hara for the respondents.
James J. O'Brien, Petitioner, 442 vs. Percy P. Anderson et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. James J. O'Brien, p. p., and by Mr. Arthur M. Marsh and Mr. William H. O'Hara for the respondents.
Gertrude E. Fonda et al., Plaintiffs in Error, 447 vs.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Marvelle C. Webber for the

Peninsular Portland Cement Company, Petitioner, 449 vs. Consolidation Coal Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Theodore K. Bryant for the petitioner.
American Railway Express Company, Petitioner, 451 vs. A. J. Lindenburg.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. D. C. T. Davis, Jr., for the petitioner.
John Barton Payne, Director General, etc., Petitioner, 454 vs. A. E. Stevens et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Gregory L. Smith for the petitioner.
Edward Kelley et al., Petitioners, 457 vs. West Braddock Bridge Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Charles Koonce, Jr., for the petitioners, and by Mr. Edwin W. Smith for the respondent.
Hyman Katz et al., Petitioners, 462 vs. The United States of America.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Asa P. French and Mr. David R. Radovsky for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. William C. Herron for the respondent.
The Kansas City Southern Railway Company, Petitioner, 463 vs. Elizabeth Van Zant.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Cyrus Crane for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles N. Montgomery for the respondent.
James C. Davis, Director General, etc., Petitioner, 471 vs. State Industrial Commission et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William L. Patton and Mr. Silas H. Strawn for the petitioner, and by Mr. John F. McCarron for the respondents.
George Moorehead et al., Petitioners, 473 vs. The United States of America.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William H. Watkins for the petitioners, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Cox for the

John A. Savage, Petitioner,
474 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William H. Dickson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

A. C. Townley et al.,
Petitioners,
475 vs.
The State of Minnesota.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. George Nordlin for the petitioners.

George H. McFadden Brothers Agency et al., Petitioners,
476 vs.
Standard Warehouse & Compress Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. J. Blanc Monroe, Mr. Mon M. Lemann, and Mr. Walter J. Suthon, Jr., for the petitioners.

Globe & Rutgers Fire Insurance Company, Petitioner,
477 vs.
Walker D. Hines, as Agent, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Pierre M. Brown for the petitioner, by Mr. Henry J. Bigham for the respondent, and by Mr. C. I. Clarke as amicus curiae.

Great Northern Railway Company, Petitioner,
481 vs.
Vivian H. Steinke et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. M. L. Countryman and Mr. C. J. Murphy for the petitioner.

Fred W. Weitzel, Petitioner,
482 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. A. E. Stricklett for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. William C. Herron for the respondent.

Moritz Loewenthal, Petitioner,
486 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John A. Cline for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Mexico North Western Railway Company, Petitioner,
489 vs.
F. L. Williams.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Alexander Britton and Mr A. H. Culwell for the petitioner.

Dunkley Company, Petitioner,
490 vs.
California Packing Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Fred L. Chappell for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. S. Pillsbury, Mr. Alfred S. Sutro, Mr. H. D. Pillsbury, and Mr. Oscar Sutro for the respondent.

Rockford Palace Furniture Company, Petitioner,
493 vs.
Robert D. Paden.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Roy F. Hall for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harry B. North for the respondent.

Gould & Curry Mining Company, Petitioner,
497 vs.
W. G. Douglas.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. W. E. F. Dale for the petitioner, and by Mr. George Springmeyer for the respondent.

Alvin M. Muck et ux., Petitioners,
504 vs.
Weyerhaeuser Timber Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Charles R. Pierce and Mr. John M. Sutton for the petitioners, and by Mr. Charles H. Carey, Mr. James B. Kerr and Mr. Charles A. Hart for the respondent.

Erath County, Texas, et al., Petitioners,
507 vs.
Powell, Garard & Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. George Thompson and Mr. J. H. Barwise, Jr., for the petitioners.

Texas Ranger Producing & Refining Company, Petitioners,
514 vs.
E. T. Robinson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Cecil H. Smith and Mr. H. O. Head for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. D. Wilkinson for the respondent.

Leopold Harris, Petitioner,
516 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Roger B. Wood for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. William C. Herron for the respondent.

Arminius Chemical Company, Petitioner,
519 vs.
Acme Manufacturing Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. C. V. Meredith for the petitioner, and by Mr. T. D. Savage for the respondent.

Hector H. Elwell, Petitioner,
522 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Roy D. Keehn for the petitioner.

C. W. Anderson et al.,
Petitioners,
523 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Otto Christensen for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Southern Pacific Company,
Petitioner,
529 vs.
Industrial Accident Commission of California et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Henley C. Booth and Mr. W. F. Herrin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Warren H. Pillsbury for the respondents.

Henry S. DeRees, Petitioner,
531 vs.
David Costaguta et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Marion Erwin and Mr. Frederick M. Czaki for the petitioner, and by Mr. Walter H. Merritt for the respondents.

City and County of San Francisco, Petitioner,
534 vs.
Postal Telegraph Cable Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. George Lull, Mr. Charles S. Peery, and Mr. Maurice T. Dooling, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Delger Trowbridge and Mr. J. A. Van Arsdale for the respondent.

Dermott Land & Lumber Company, Petitioner,
537 vs.
Walter A. Zelnicker Supply Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Shepard Barclay for the petitioner.

Powell, Garard & Company,
Petitioner,
551 vs.
Erath County, Texas, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. H. V. Davidson for the petitioner.

The Studebaker Corporation,
Petitioner,
558 vs.
Gear Grinding Machine Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Frederick P. Fish and Mr. Edward Hector for the petitioner, and by Mr. D. Anthony Usina and Mr. Melville Church for

Perlman Rim Corporation, Petitioner, 495 vs. Louis de F. Munger. for the respondent.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Melville Church and Mr. John Thomas Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. William B. Greeley.
Silas Williams, Trustee, etc., Petitioner, 350 vs. The National Discount Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. J. W. Thompson and Mr. Paul Campbell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Austin V. Cannon for the respondent.
James A. Baker, Receiver, etc., et al., Plaintiffs in Error, 488 vs. Karl L. Druesedow, Tax Collector, etc., et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Samuel B. Dabney for the plaintiffs in error in support of the petition.
The People of the State of Michigan ex rel. Alex. J. Groesbeck, Attorney General, etc., Plaintiff in Error, 104 vs. Detroit United Railway.	The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted by Mr. William L. Carpenter and Mr. Elliott G. Stevenson for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Merlin Wiley, Mr. Clare Retan and Mr. S. F. Masters for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.
The Detroit Edison Company, Petitioner, 453 vs. Jewett, Bigelow & Brooks.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. J. O. Murfin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hal H. Smith for the respondent.
A. Klipstein & Company, Petitioner, 437 vs. Garbiss Dilsizian et al., etc. Henry J. Bigham for the respondents.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John J. Schwartz for the petitioner, add by Mr.
Krauss Brothers Lumber Company, Plaintiff in Error, 362 vs. Board of Assessors for the Parish	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Burt W. Henry for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition.

H. L. and R. V. Grayson, Petitioners,
406 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Samuel Bosworth Smith for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the respondent.

Margaret Ford, as Administratrix, etc., Petitioner,
458 vs.
James C. Davis, Director General, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Thomas A. Sullivan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Halsey Sayles for the respondent.

Charles Vincenti et al., Petitioners,
339 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Levi H. David for the petitioners.

Iowa Gas & Electric Company, Appellant,
22 vs.
City of Mt. Pleasant, Iowa, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Copper Queen Consolidated Mining Company, Plaintiff in Error,
129 vs.
Joseph C. Mayne.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed without costs to either party.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Carlos Carmelo Garcia, Appellant, vs. James B. Holohan, U. S. Marshal, etc., et al. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

181

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. D. Cole, E. C. Hanks, et al., Appellants, vs. James W. Sullinger, United States Attorney for the Western District of Missouri. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

197

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellants to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Pullman Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Minnesota. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

227

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Julius N. Heldman, Petitioner, vs. Central Trust Company of Illinois. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

243

It appearing to the Court that authority of counsel for the

petitioner to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said authority, it is now here ordered by this Court, that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles O'Connor et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
301. vs.
John Slaker, Administrator, et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm herein was submitted by Mr. Henry H. Wilson, Mr. Elmer J. Burkett, and Mr. W. T. Thompson for the defendants in error in support of the motion and by Mr. James M. Johnson for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

The I. T. S. Rubber Company,
Appellant,
356 vs.
Essex Rubber Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

S. C. Crookshank, Appellant,
389 vs.
Charles H. Stone, Chief of Police of the City of Bakersfield.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Associated Billposters and Distributors of the United States

1. vs. The United States. — On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee, this cause was passed pursuant to the twenty-sixth rule.

Takao Ozawa, vs. The United States. — On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee, this cause was passed pursuant to the twenty-sixth rule.

The United States of America, Appellant, vs. Keystone Watch Case Company. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Keystone Watch Case Company, Appellant, vs. The United States of America. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, in behalf of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John C. Robinson et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States of America on behalf of and for the use of Brown-Ketcham Iron Works et al. — In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the

respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed.

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

R. D. Langan, et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
171 vs.
The City of Louisville.

This cause was argued by Mr. John Bryce Baskin for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. Harry E. Tincher for the defendant in error.

American Steel Foundries,
Petitioner,
2 vs.
Tri-City Central Trades Council
et al.

The reargument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Max Pam for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Frank C. Smith for the respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, October 5, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Max Pam, it is ordered that Weymouth Kirkland, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Patrick H. Kelley, it is ordered that Guy W. Selby, Esquire, of Flint, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Reed, it is ordered that John B. Pew, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced an order as to the Clerk's bond.

Which said order is in the words and figures following, viz.:

"ORDER.

ORDERED THAT:

1. In addition to his official bond now required of him by law, the Clerk shall furnish, for the benefit of parties litigant in this Court who have deposited amounts to cover costs and fees, a bond, in such amount and with such surety or sureties as shall be approved by the Chief Justice,

conditioned to secure the proper performance by the Clerk of the services, to compensate which, such deposits were made, and a true and faithful accounting by him of any excess which may be due them out of such deposits after such costs and fees have been earned and paid, and also of any other moneys received by him as Clerk, according to law or the orders of the Court.

2. Interest on the bank deposits of the Clerk accruing from moneys thus paid him by litigants shall be kept by the Clerk as a separate fund, out of which he shall pay, first, the reasonable cost to him, if any, of the bond above described, and, second, the cost of annual or special audits, directed by the Chief Justice, of the receipt, disbursement, or disposition of all moneys deposited with him by litigants as aforesaid. Upon order of the Court, whatever shall remain of said separate fund shall be used to make up any deficits arising from a failure of the costs and fees to meet the expenses of the Clerk's Office and to pay his own compensation provided by law.

3. After the costs and fees in cases have been earned and paid and the cases closed, any excess of such deposits with the Clerk shall be transferred by him to a special fund in some responsible bank or trust company, there to remain until such moneys shall be claimed by, and paid to, the parties entitled, or shall be otherwise disposed of by order of the Court or by law.

4. The increment of interest earned on the fund described in Paragraph 3 shall, upon order of the Court, be used for the same purposes as those enumerated in Paragraph 2.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
20, Original. vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant.
The United States of America,
Intervenor.

It is ordered that the interveners herein claiming under or through the State of Texas be permitted to appear before the commissioner now taking evidence respecting the true boundary line along the south bank of Red River and to present evidence bearing on that question and in support of their claims; and the evidence so presented shall be subject to rebuttal in the same way and at the same time as that presented by the State of Texas.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, 20, Original. vs. The State of Texas. The United States of America, Intervener.	The time for the hearing herein as to certain special issues and claims heretofore fixed for the 17th day of October, 1921, is postponed and changed to the 5th day of December, 1921.
The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, 20, Original. vs. The State of Texas. The United States of America, Intervener.	Leave is hereby granted Mr. R. H. Ward to file answers to certain motions within two weeks.
Edward F. Jackman, Plaintiff in Error, 14 vs. The Rosenbaum Company.	It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed pursuant to the 26th rule.
The Atherton Mills, Appellant, 16 vs. Eugene T. Johnston et al.	On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf, it is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed pursuant to the 26th rule.
James R. Ward, Plaintiff in Error, 18 vs. The People of the State of Illinois ex rel. Chicago Bar Association.	It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed pursuant to the 26th rule.
American Steel Foundries, Petitioner, 2 vs. The Tri-City Central Trades Council et al.	The reargument of this cause was continued by Mr. Frank C. Smith for the respondent and concluded by Mr. Max Pam for the petitioner.
Joseph W. Nicholas, Appellant, 10 vs. The United States; and Wilson Scott Norris, Appellant, 11 vs. The United States.	These causes were argued as one cause, on motion of Mr. William E. Russell for the appellants; being argued by Mr. William E. Russell for the appellants, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Hiter for the appellee.

Louis H. Eberlein, Appellant,
12 vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. William E. Russel
for the appellant, and was submitted by Mr.
Assistant Attorney General Davis and Mr. Willi
D. Harris for the appellee.

William Truax et al., etc.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
13 vs.
Michael Corrigan et al.

The reargument of this cause was commenced by
Mr. Clifton Mathews for the plaintiffs in erro

Thursday, October 6th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Watson, it is ordered that Charles J. McDermott , Esquire, of New York City, and James A. Watson, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. D. M. Kelleher, it is ordered that Fred C. Gilchrist, Esquire, of Laurens, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. A. Redding, it is ordered that Ambrose L. O'Shea, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Murray Seasongood, it is ordered that Charles S. Bell, Esquire, and Louis H. Capelle, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio; and Robert W. Shultice, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. B. Ames, it is ordered that P. B. Swank, Esquire, of Norman, State of Oklahoma, and

Morgan G. Sanders, Esquire, of Canton, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

The bond executed by the Clerk pursuant to the order of the Court entered October 5th, 1921, was filed in the words and figures following, viz.:

"KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS, That we, William R. Stansbury, Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States, as principal, and THE AETNA CASUALTY & SURETY COMPANY as surety, are held and firmly bound, for the period of three years beginning with the execution hereof, unto the United States of America, for the benefit of the litigants in the Supreme Court of the United States and of all others, as their interests may appear, in the penal sum of ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($100,000.) lawful money of the United States, to be paid to the said United States for the benefit of the said litigants and of all others, as their interests may appear, for which payments, well and truly to be made, we bind ourselves, our and each of our heirs, executors, administrators and assigns, jointly and severally, firmly by these presents.

Sealed with our seals, and dated this 6th day of October, 1921.

NOW THEREFORE, the condition of this bond is such that if the said William R. Stansbury, Clerk as aforesaid, shall well and truly perform the services for which moneys by law or under the rules of the Court are advance or paid to him, and shall truly and faithfully account for such moneys thus advanced or paid, and for any excess thereof after the services are rendered, and also for all other moneys received by him as such Clerk, in accordance with law or the orders of this Court, then this obligation to be void; otherwise to remain in full force and virtue in law.

(Signed) WM. R. STANSBURY.

THE AETNA CASUALTY & SURETY COMPANY

(Signed) BY: J. T. Jones, (SEAL)

Attorney-in-fact.

(Signed) C. ELMORE CROPLEY

(Signed) M. L. LEWIS.

Approved (Signed) WM. H. TAFT, by order of the Court.

Chief Justice of the United States.

The rate of premium on this bond is $2.00 per annum; the total amount of premium charged is $200.00 per annum. ($2.00 revenue stamps cancelled.)

ORDERED That the bond for $100,000., additional to his official bond, required of the Clerk by order of the Court dated October 4th, 1921, and duly executed by him, and The Aetna Casualty Company, on October 6th, 1921, and approved by the Chief Justice, shall be deposited with the Attorney General for safe keeping.

John M. Anderson, Plaintiff in Error,
27 vs.
Peter W. Durr, as former Auditor,
et al.

On motion of Mr. Murray Seasongood for the plaintiff in error, the death of John M. Anderson, plaintiff in error in this cause, was suggested and the Citizens National Bank of Cincinnati, administrator with the will annexed of the estate of John M. Anderson, deceased, was substituted as the party plaintiff in error herein.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
20, Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

The motion of Francis Chanate and others for leave to intervene in this cause was submitted by Mr. Henry E. Asp in that behalf.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
20, Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

The motion to set petition in intervention of D. D. Brunson for hearing was submitted by Mr. D. D. Brunson in that behalf.

The Standard Fashion Company, Petitioner,
20 vs.
Magrane-Houston Company.

It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed pursuant to the twenty-sixth rule.

Charlotte Harbor & Northern Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
24 vs.
W. G. Welles et al., etc.

It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed pursuant to the twenty-sixth rule.

Albert Remmie, Plaintiff in Error,
25 vs.
John W. Gibson.

This cause was submitted by Mr. John A. McClure for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. R. B. Brown for the defendant in error.

William Truax et al., etc.,
Plaintiffs in Error,

Michael Corrigan et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston for the defendants in error and concluded by Mr. Clifton Mathews for the plaintiff in error.

The Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
15 vs.
The City of Clarksdale.

This cause was argued by Mr. H. D. Minor for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. Gerald Fitz Gerald for the defendant in error.

Edward C. Ward, Plaintiff in Error,
17 vs.
The State of Washington et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. W. F. Magill for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. L.L. Thompson for the defendants in error.

The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
19 vs.
Daniel J. Perry.

This cause was reargued by Mr. Phil D. Brewer for the defendant in error, and case submitted by Mr. C. O. Blake, Mr. W.R. Bleakman, Mr. John W. Willmott, Mr. H.J. Roberts, Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage, and Mr. S. F. Taliaferro, for the plaintiff in error.

Peter Wilson, Plaintiff in Error,
21 vs.
Republic Iron & Steel Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. W. A. Denson for the plaintiff in error.

Friday, October 7th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Ellen Spencer Mussey, it is ordered that Clara Friedman Brode, of Memphis, State of Tennessee; May Warner, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, and Ruth Levey, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry Heidelberg, it is ordered that William Klein, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry Hertzoff, it is ordered that Jacob H. Corn, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard P. Ernst, it is ordered that Harry T. Klein, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Murray Seasongood, it is ordered that Ralph A. Kreimer, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this

Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Paul Barnest, it is ordered that Abb L. Landis, Esquire, of Nashville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Burt E. Burlow, it is ordered that Hope Thompson, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John F. McCarron, it is ordered that Redmond S. Brennan, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Charles D. Newton, Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants,
40 vs.
The Brooklyn Union Gas Company.

This cause was passed pursuant to the 16th rule, on motion of Mr. Harry Herzoff for the appellants.

Hannah T. Willson, Plaintiff in Error,
34 vs.
Curtis C. McDonnell.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Henry E. Davis, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Boter Wilson, Plaintiff in Error,
21 vs.
Republic Iron and Steel Company et al.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. W. A. Denson for the plaintiff in error, and cause submitted by Mr. Augustus Benners for the defendants in error.

William Breiholz et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
23 vs.
The Board of Supervisors of
Pocahontas County, Iowa, et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Denis M. Kelleher for the plaintiffs in error, continued by Mr. F. C. Gilchrist and Mr. Robert Healy for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. Denis M. Kelleher for the plaintiffs in error.

John Horstmann Company, Appellant,
26 vs.
The United States; and
Natron Soda Company, Appellant,
32 vs.
The United States.

The motion to consolidate these cases was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee.
The motion to remand No. 32 was submitted by Mr. Frank S. Bright for the appellant.
The cases were argued by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the United States, and cases submitted by Mr. Edward M. Cleary and Mr. Thomas A. Allen for the appellant in No. 26, and by Mr. Frank S. Bright and Mr. H. Stanley Hinrichs for the appellant in No. 32.

Citizens National Bank of Cincinnati, Administrator, etc.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
27 vs.
Peter W. Durr, as former Auditor,
et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Murray Seasongood for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Charles S. Bell for the defendants in error.

Western Fuel Company,
28 vs.
Antone Garcia, as Administrator, etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Joseph F. Murray for the Western Fuel Company.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, October 10th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Miss Dora Falkin, it is ordered that Rose M. Palmer, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. P. Freeling, it is ordered that Grattan G. McVay, Esquire, of Ardmore; Loren M. Gensman, Esquire, of Lawton; and Joseph T. Dillard, of Waurika, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that Stacy H. Myers, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; Jesse R. Langley, Esquire, Harold C. Lowe, Esquire, and Warren H. Van Kirk, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John M. Slaton, it is ordered that George M. Napier, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Norman Fischer, it is ordered that Stanley H. Fischer, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia,

be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles S. Whitman, it is ordered that Jacob H. Goetz, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Gordon Mathews, it is ordered that John C. Donnally, Esquire, and R. C. Altizer, Esquire, of Charleston, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Welwood Murray, it is ordered that Harrison Tweed, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Daniel Upthegrove, it is ordered that Frank H. Moore, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. Carroll Todd, it is ordered that Stark B. Ferriss, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John M. Coleman, it is ordered that James I. Cuff, Esquire, William R. Willcox, Esquire, Stanley C. Fowler, Esquire, and Grant Hoerner, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leslie C. Garnett, it is ordered that Henry Ward Beer, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. S. P. Patteson, it is ordered that Thomas B. Snead, Esquire, of Richmond, State of

Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

ORDER.

On the application of the Clerk, pursuant to Section 221 of the Judicial Code, IT IS ORDERED that PHILANDER R. STANSBURY be, and he is hereby, appointed a Deputy Clerk of this Court.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

OATH.

I, PHILANDER R. STANSBURY, being appointed a Deputy Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States, do solemnly swear that I will truly and faithfully enter and record all the orders, decrees, judgments and proceedings of the said Court, and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all the duties of my said office, according to the best of my abilities and understanding. So help me God.

(Signed) PHILANDER R. STANSBURY.

Sworn and subscribed to before me, this 10 day of October, A.D.1921.

(Signed) WM. H. TAFT,
Chief Justice of the
United States.

ORDER.

On the application of the Clerk, pursuant to Section 221 of the Judicial Code, IT IS ORDERED that C. ELMORE CROPLEY be, and he is hereby appointed an additional Deputy Clerk of this Court.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

OATH.

I, C. ELMORE CROPLEY, being appointed a Deputy Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States, do solemnly swear that I will truly and faithfully enter and record all the orders, decrees, judgments and proceedings of the said Court, and that I will faithfullyand impartially discharge and perform all the duties of my said office, according to the best of my abilities and understanding. So help me God.

(Signed) C. ELMORE CROPLEY.

Sworn and subscribed to before me, this 10 day of October, A.D.1921.

(Signed) WM. H. TAFT,

ORDER.

Ordered that the fees paid to the Clerk by attorneys for admission to the bar of the Court, which are not included in the costs, fees and emoluments of which, under the Acts of March 3, 1883, 22 Statutes, 631, and Section 8 of the Act of March 15, 1898, 30 Statutes, 317, the Clerk is required to make return to the Attorney General, shall, over and above $3,000 in any one year, be kept as a fund to be expended under the order of the Court, first, for the reimbursement of the Clerk for any costs, and fees in litigated cases, in which the parties, or either of them, are authorized to proceed in forma pauperis; second, to reimburse the Clerk for any deficit which may arise in the running of his office, including his personal compensation under the Act of March 3, 1883, as aforesaid; and, third, for any other purpose deemed proper and ordered by the Court.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte, In the matter of Mary Ellen Bain, Petitioner.
No. ___, Original.

ON CONSIDERATION of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein,

IT IS NOW HERE ORDERED BY THIS COURT that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chanslor-Canfield Midway Oil Company et al., Appellants,
162 vs.
The United States of America.

ON CONSIDERATION of the joint motion of the appellant Chanslor-Canfield Midway Oil Company and the appellee that this cause be remanded with instructions that the settlement of the cause reached pursuant to the Act of Congress of February 25, 1920, be carried into effect,

IT IS NOW HERE ORDERED BY THIS COURT that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Armstrong Chaloner, Plaintiff in Error,
54 vs.
W. Gilmer Dunn.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Virginia

and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

ON CONSIDERATION WHEREOF, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of North Dakota,
Complainant,
12, Original. vs.
The State of Minnesota; and

The State of South Dakota,
Complainant,
13, Original. vs.
The State of Minnesota.

IT IS ORDERED BY THIS COURT that the motion to consolidate these cases be, and the same is hereby, postponed to be considered when the cases are reached.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of New Mexico,
Complainant,
19, Original. vs.
The State of Colorado.

ON CONSIDERATION of the motion to strike out parts of the answer,
IT IS NOW HERE ORDERED BY THIS COURT that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, without prejudice to its being presented when the case is reached on the merits.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Wyoming, Complainant,
3, Original. vs.
The State of Colorado et al.

ON CONSIDERATION of the motion to set this cause for hearing,
IT IS NOW HERE ORDERED BY THIS COURT that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the case assigned for argument on Tuesday, January 3, 1922.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Central Railroad Company of New Jersey et al., Appellants,
436 vs.
The United States of America et al.

ON CONSIDERATION of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 14th next.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of North Dakota ex rel. William Lemke, Attorney General, Complainant, vs. Chicago & North Western Railway Company et al.

25, Original.

ON CONSIDERATION of the motion for an interlocutory injunction herein, IT IS NOW HERE ORDERED BY THIS COURT that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of North Dakota ex rel. William Lemke, Attorney General, Complainant, vs. Chicago & North Western Railway Company et al.

25, Original.

ON CONSIDERATION of the motion for leave to further amend the original bill of complaint herein, IT IS NOW HERE ORDERED BY THIS COURT that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Union Trust Company of San Francisco et al., Executors, etc., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Justus S. Wardell, United States Collector, etc., et al.

236

ON CONSIDERATION of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harriet L. Levy et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Justus S. Wardell, United States Collector, etc., et al.

303

ON CONSIDERATION of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ward & Gow, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Himan Krinskry et al.

343

ON CONSIDERATION of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Territory of Alaska et al., Appellants,
392 vs.
John W. Troy, Collector of Customs, etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William H. Bryan, Appellant,
428 vs.
Joshua W. Miles, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Galveston Electric Company, Appellant,
455 vs.
The City of Galveston et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Western Union Telegraph Company, Plaintiff in Error,
259 vs.
Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, January 3, 1922, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The People of the State of Michigan ex rel. Alex. J.Groesbeck, Attorney General, etc.,
104 vs.
Detroit United Railway.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and on motion to dismiss or affirm

which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cornelia G. Goodrich et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. West Lumber Company. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas.

158

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Texas, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction upon the ground that there is no federal question presented in the record.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles O'Connor et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. John Slaker, Acting Administrator de bonis non of the Estate of John O'Connor, deceased, et al. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

301

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction on the ground that there is no federal question presented in the record.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louisiana Railway and Navigation Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. R. E. Williams. — In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

353

the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction, with imposition of five per cent. penalty under the 23d Rule.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants,
257 vs.
Consolidated Gas Company of New York; and
Consolidated Gas Company of New York, Appellant,
258 vs.
Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al.; and
Consolidated Gas Company of New York, Appellant,
288 vs.
Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion to consolidate and reassign these cases,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, granted, and the cases reassigned for argument on Monday, November 14th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants,
295 vs.
The Kings County Lighting Company, and
Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants,
296 vs.
New York & Queens Gas Company.

On consideration of the motions to reassign these cases,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby granted, and the cases reassigned for argument on Monday, November 14th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The American Railway Express Company, Plaintiff in Error,
324 vs.
The Commonwealth of Kentucky.

On consideration of the motion for a writ of certiorari upon suggestion of diminution of the record herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that

the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the matter presented with the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex Parte Paige. On consideration of the motion for
No. ---,Original. leave to proceed in forma pauperis
herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex Parte Herrick. On consideration of the motion for leave
No.---, Original. to proceed in forma pauperis herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex Parte Ormsby. On consideration of the motion for leave
No.---, Original. to proceed in forma pauperis herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby,denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dharandas Tulsidas et al., Petitioners, On petition for writ of certiorari to
314 vs. the Supreme Court of the Philippine
The Insular Collector of Customs. Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Director General of On consideration of the petition for a
Railroads, etc., Plaintiff in Error, writ of certiorari herein,
327 vs. It is now here ordered by this Court that
J. J. Smith, Jr., Administrator, etc. the said petition be, and the same is
hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Ewen, Petitioner,
348 vs.
American Fidelity Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Minnesota Commercial Men's Association, Petitioner,
379 vs.
Minnie Mae Benn, as Executrix, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles McKelvey et al., Petitioners,
382 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Regal Drug Corporation, Petitioner,
386 vs.
Justus S. Wardell, as United States Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Colonial Beach Company, Owner, etc., Petitioner,
388 vs.
Quemahoning Coal Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The New York Central and Hudson River Railroad Company, Petitioner,
391 vs.
John W. Kinney.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Mills Company, Petitioner,
405 vs.
American Surety Company of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Ohio ex rel. Allen J. Seney, Prosecuting Attorney, etc., Appellant,
300 vs.
Swift & Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

P. B. Hunter, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 316

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Garfield Priolean, Petitioner, vs. The United States. 331

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kissel Motor Car Company, Petitioner, vs. T. L. Walker et al. 337

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Vincenti et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 339

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. E. Armsby Company, Petitioner, vs. The Steamship "Esrom", her engines, etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

341

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oliver J. Olson, Owner, et al., Petitioners, vs. Charles F. Adams et al., Trustees, etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

342

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

First National Bank of Philadelphia, Petitioner, vs. J. Walter Farrell et al., etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

349

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. Walter Farrell et al., Petitioners, vs. First National Bank of Philadelphia. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals of the Third Circuit.

419

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the

said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Silas Williams, Trustee, etc., Petitioner,
350 vs.
The National Discount Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sidney S. McConnell, as Receiver, etc., Petitioner,
351 vs.
Walter C. Hubbard et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to theUnited States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Salvatore Lauria, Petitioner,
354 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Panhandle Grain & Elevator Company, Petitioner,
360 vs.
Cromwell Brothers.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered that the said

petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Morse Dry Dock & Repair Company, Petitioner,
361 vs.
Steamship "Nord Alexis", etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Krauss Brothers Lumber Company, Plaintiff in Error,
362 vs.
Board of Assessors for the Parish of Orleans et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank H. Hereford, Petitioner,
371 vs.
Edwin A. Meserve.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William J. Crittenden, Petitioner,
375 vs.
Dora Widrevitz, as Administratrix, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to

the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Erie Railroad Company, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to
384 vs. the Supreme Court of the State of New York.
Ida Cott, as Administratrix, etc.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Erie Railroad Company, as Lessee, etc., Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to
385 vs. the Supreme Court of the State of New York.
Ida Cott, as Administratrix, etc.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fred L. Lezinsky et al., Petitioners, On petition for writ of certiorari to
387 vs. the Supreme Court of the State of
Mason Malt Whiskey Distilling Company, etc., et al. California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ed. Slocum, as Trustee, etc., Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to
400 vs. the United States Circuit Court of
Anna Halliday et al. Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to

the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry Lefkowitz et al., Petitioners, 404 vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

H. L. and R. V. Grayson, Petitioners, 406 vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John H. Martens et al., Petitioners, 409 vs. Twin Falls-Oakley Land & Water Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner, 333 vs. Winsted Hosiery Company. — The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner, 533 vs. Fruit Growers' Express, Inc. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner.

Julius P. Smietanka, as Collector, etc., Petitioner,
540 vs.
First Trust & Savings Bank, Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioners, and by Mr. John P. Wilson, Mr. William B.Hale and Mr. Walter Bruce Howe for respondent.

Lorraine de la Montanya Crittenden et al., Petitioners,
549 vs.
Narcissus Augustus Dorn et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. George F. Williams in behalf of Mr. Frank R. Wehe for the petitioners, and by Mr. A. E. Cooley for the respondents.

The State of Texas et al., Appellants,
563 vs.
The United States, et al.

On motion of Mr. Tom L. Beauchamp for the appellants, it is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, advanced, to be heard with No. 298.

Arthur J. Dahn, Petitioner,
166 vs.
John Barton Payne, Director General of Railroads of the United States.

On motion of Mr. J. Wilmer Latimer for the petitioner, it is ordered that James C. Davis, the present Director General of Railroads, be substituted as the party respondent in this cause in the place of John Barton Payne, resigned.

Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York, Plaintiff in Error,
215 vs.
Mary S. Liebing.

The motion to dismiss or affirm herein was submitted by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney in behalf of Mr. James J. O'Donohoe for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Frederick L.Allen, Mr.John H.Holliday, Mr.Frederic D.McKenney and Mr. William Marshall Bullitt in opposition thereto.

Louis Brownlow et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
369 vs.
Mollie Schwartz.

The motion to dismiss herein was submitted by Mr. W. Gwynn Gardiner for the defendant in error in support of the motion, with leave to Mr. F. H. Stephens to file brief in opposition thereto.

A. C. Townley et al., Petitioners,
475 vs.
The State of Minnesota.

On motion of Mr. James E. Markham in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to file brief in opposition to the petition for writ of certiorari herein.

American Column & Lumber Company et al., Appellants,

71 vs. The United States.

On motion of Mr. William J. Mathews and Mr. Hugh T. Martin in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to file brief herein as amicus curiae.

Nichols Field Wilson et al., Petitioners,
576 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John M. Coleman, Mr. Stanley C. Fowler, and Mr. Grant Hoerner for the petitioners.

Nichols Field Wilson et al., Petitioners,
576 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. William R. Wilcox in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to file brief herein as amicus curiae.

John C. Heald et al., Committee, etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
268 vs.
The District of Columbia.

On motion of Mr. Vernon E. West for the plaintiffs in error, the death of Eugene Peters, one of the plaintiffs in error herein, was suggested, and it is ordered that Augustus S. Worthington and John C. Heald, Executors of the will of Eugene Peters, deceased, be substituted as the parties plaintiff in error in this cause.

It is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed per stipulation of counsel.

The State of Texas, Appellant,
298 vs.
Eastern Texas Railroad Company et al.;
and
The State of Texas, etc., Appellant,
563 vs.
The United States of America et al.

On motion of Mr. Daniel Upthegrove in that behalf, it is ordered that these causes be, and the same are hereby, reassigned for November 14th next.

James J. Rafferty, Collector, etc., Petitioner,
138 vs.
Smith, Bell & Company, Limited;

James J. Rafferty, as Collector, etc., Petitioner,
140 vs.

and

James J. Rafferty, as Collector, etc., Petitioner,
142 vs.
Visayan Refining Company.

On motion of Mr. Clarence B. Miller for the respondents, it is ordered that cases Nos. 140 and 142 be consolidated; and these cases are reassigned for argument at the foot of the call.

J. M. Pharr & Sons, Limited, Petitioner,
558 vs.
C. D. Kenney Company.

On motion of Mr. Frederick T. Saussy and Mr. Edgar Watkins in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to file brief herein as amici curiae.

Traylor Engineering & Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
330 vs.
Ephraim Lederer, Collector, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Worth E. Caylor for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Robert P. Reeder for the respondent.

J. Herman Dierkes, Petitioner,
515 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Frederick W. Schmitz for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. H. S. Ridgely for the respondent.

L. W. Wineman et al., etc., Petitioners,
517 vs.
Anderson-Tully Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Percy Bell for the petitioners, and by Mr. Allen Hughes for the respondents.

Joe Dubman, Petitioner,
547 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. P. H. Cullen for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim and Mr. William C. Herron for the respondent.

J. M. Pharr & Sons, Limited, Petitioner,
558 vs.
C. D. Kenney Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. H. E. Milling for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. J. Waguespack for the respondent.

Walker D. Hines, Director General, etc., Petitioner,
559 vs.
Anthony Kowalski.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Albert C. Wall, Mr. John A. Hartpence, and Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for the petitioner, and by Mr.

Tennessee, Alabama & Georgia Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,
229 vs.
W. M. Drake.

The motion to dismiss herein was submitted by Mr. George Westmoreland for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Samuel Bosworth Smith and Mr. George E. Maddox for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Charles Cornell, Appellant,
174 vs.
George H. Moore, Collector of Internal Revenue; and

George J. Ghio, Appellant,
175 vs.
George H. Moore, Collector of Internal Revenue.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee, it is ordered that these causes be, and the same are hereby, reassigned for December 5th next.

The State of New York et al., Appellants,
283 vs.
The United States et al.

It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed pursuant to the twenty-sixth rule.

Edgar A. Levy Leasing Company, Inc., Plaintiff in Error,
285 vs.
Jerome Siegel.

It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed pursuant to the twenty-sixth rule.

The People of the State of New York ex rel. Brixton Operating Corporation, Plaintiff in Error,
286 vs.
Edward B. La Fetra, a Justice, etc.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

810 West End Avenue, Inc.,
Plaintiff in Error,

Henry R. Stern.

It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed pursuant to the twenty-sixth rule.

Western Fuel Company
28 vs.
Antone Garcia, as Administrator, etc.

The reargument of this cause was continued by Mr. Joseph F. Murray for Western Fuel Company, and concluded by Mr. Henry Heidelberg for Antone Garcia, as administrator, etc.

Dahnke-Walker Milling Company, Plaintiff in Error,
30 vs.
C. T. Bonjurant.

This cause was reargued by Mr. John C. Doolan for the plaintiff in error, and submitted by Mr. M. Walton Hendry for the defendant in error.

J. W. Hurley, Appellant,
33 vs.
The Commission of Fisheries of Virginia et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Thomas B. Snead for the appellant, and continued by Mr. Robert W. Shultice for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, October 11th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert W. Shultice, it is ordered that James H. Hayes, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, it is ordered that William Lawrence Underwood, Esquire, of Patchogue, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

J. W. Hurley, Appellant,
33 vs.
The Commission of Fisheries of Virginia et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Robert W. Shultice for the appellees, and was concluded by Mr. S. S. P. Patteson for the appellant.

Daniel Boyle et al., Appellants,
36 vs.
A. M. Holter Hardware Company et al.

It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed for settlement.

The United States, Appellant,
260 vs.
C. W. Phellis.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellant; continued by Mr. William A. Glasgow, Jr., and Mr. Frank S. Bright for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellant.

John D. Rockefeller,

Plaintiff in Error,

535 vs.

The United States of America; and

The New York Trust Company et al.,

Executors, etc., Plaintiffs in Error,

536 vs.

William H. Edwards, Collector of

United States Internal Revenue, etc.

The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. George Welwood Murray for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, October 12th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward E. Browne, it is ordered that William J. Conway, Esquire, of Wisconsin Rapids, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ralph B. Fleharty, it is ordered that Joseph A. Albrecht, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. F. Colladay, it is ordered that Benjamin B. Pettus, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Georgia, Complainant,
16,Original. vs.
The State of South Carolina.

On motion of Mr. George M. Napier in that behalf, it is ordered that this case be set for argument on January 3, 1922.

John D. Rockefeller, Plaintiff in Error,
535 vs.
The United States of America; and

The New York Trust Company et al., Executors, etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
536 vs.
William H. Edwards, Collector of United States Internal Revenue, etc.

The argument of these causes was continued by Mr. George Welwood Murray for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the defendants in error, and was concluded by Mr. George Welwood Murray for the plaintiffs in error.

American Column & Lumber Company et al., Appellants,
71 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee, four hours are allowed for the reargument of this cause.

The reargument was commenced by Mr. Louis Claire Boyle for the appellants, and continued by Mr. James A. Fowler for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, October 13th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George F. Snyder, it is ordered that M. M. Joyce, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roscoe C. Patterson, it is ordered that George A. Neal, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to parctice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank L. Crawford, it is ordered that Charles Powell, Esquire, and Kemble White, Esquire, of Fairmont, State of West Virginia, and Hugh C. Dorworth, Esquire, of Oil City, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Oklahoma Natural Gas Company, Plaintiff in Error,
37 vs.
The State of Oklahoma et al.
pursuant to the twenty-sixth rule.

On motion of Mr. S. P. Freeling for the defendants in error, it is ordered that this case be passed, per stipulation of counsel,

American Column & Lumber Company et al.,
Appellants,

The United States of America.

The reargument of this cause was continued by Mr. James A. Fowler and Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee, and was concluded by Mr. G. Carroll Todd for the appellants.

Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Isaac C. Weber, Surviving Partner, etc., et al.

210

This cause was argued by Mr. Henry Wolfe Bikle for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. William A. Glasgow, Jr., for the defendants in error.

The Texas Company, Appellant, vs. J. J. Brown, individually, etc., et al.

126

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. John M. Slaton for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, October 14th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard Yates, it is ordered that Howard Ames, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. C. Boyle, it is ordered that Charles R. Fowler, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. H. Caraway, it is ordered that Harvey C. Combs, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John M. Slaton, it is ordered that John W. Bennett, Esquire, of Waycross, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rufus S. Day, it is ordered that Irving L. Evans, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Eureka Pipe Line Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
255 vs.
Walter S. Hallanan, State Tax Commissioner, et al.; and

United Fuel Gas Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
276 vs.
Walter S. Hallanan, State Tax Commissioner, etc., et al.

On motion of Mr. James M. Beck in behalf of counsel, it is ordered that these causes be reassigned for argument on November 7th next.

The Texas Company, Appellant,
126 vs.
J. J. Brown, individually, etc., et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. John M. Slaton for the appellant, by Mr. Mark Bolling for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Harry T. Klein for the appellant.

Julius F. Smietanka, Collector, etc.,
214 vs.
Indiana Steel Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Ottinger for the Collector, and by Mr. William Beye for the Indiana Steel Company.

Louisiana & Pine Bluff Railway Company, Appellant,
291 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Luther M. Walter for the appellant, and continued by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the United States, and by Mr. W. R. McFarland for the Interstate Commerce Commission, and was concluded by Mr. Luther M. Walter for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, October 17th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Park Trammell, it is ordered that J. Emmet Wolfe, Esquire, of Miami, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Philip Barton Warren, it is ordered that Bayard Lacey Catron, Esquire, of Springfield, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. R. Serven, it is ordered that Oscar A. Stumpe, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence R. Wilson, it is ordered that Claude R. Branch, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. Garland Dupre', it is ordered that John B. Files, Esquire, of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this

Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel A. Ettelson, it is ordered that Daniel A. Roberts, Esquire, and James W. Breen, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, 20, Original. vs. The State of Texas, Defendant, The United States, Intervener.

Upon the motion of Francis Chamate and others claiming under Indian allotments, they are granted leave to intervene herein and to file the petition of intervention tendered with such motion.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, 20, Original. vs. The State of Texas, Defendant, The United States, Intervener.

Upon the motion of D. D. Brunson, an intervener, his petition for intervention is assigned for hearing and submission with the issues heretofore assigned for hearing on December 5, 1921.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, 20, Original. vs. The State of Texas, Defendant, The United States, Intervener.

The motion of the Welish Consolidated Placer Mining Association for a modification of the order of June 1, 1921, insofar as it relates to the Burke-Senator well is denied without prejudice to a renewal of such motion if in the further progress of this cause it becomes necessary or proper to renew the same.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, 20, Original. vs. The State of Texas, Defendant, The United States, Intervener.

The motion of the Welish Consolidated Placer Mining Association for the return of wells Nos. 152, 153 and 160 to the custody of the receiver is denied without prejudice to a renewal of such motion if in the further progress of this cause it becomes necessary or proper to renew the same.

Adelbert A. Welland, as State Engineer, etc., et al., Petitioners, 3 vs. The Pioneer Irrigation Company.

It is ordered by this Court that this cause be assigned for hearing immediately following case No. 3, Original, Wyoming vs. Colorado et al., now set for Tuesday, January 3, 1922.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George Washington Pace, Appellant,
424 vs.
Fred C. Zerbst, Warden, etc.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York, Plaintiff in Error,
215 vs.
Mary S. Liebing.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

F. A. Gillespie, Plaintiff in Error,
322 vs.
The State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner,
333 vs.
Winsted Hosiery Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Champlain Realty Company, Petitioner,
426 vs.
Town of Brattleboro.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Vermont.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Vermont, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Osaka Shosen Kaisha et al.,
Petitioners,

427 vs. Pacific Export Lumber Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, etc., Petitioner, 439 vs. Mrs. Maude E. Green, Administratrix, etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Railway Express Company, Petitioner, 451 vs. A. J. Lindenburg. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Kansas City Southern Railway Company, Petitioner, 463 vs. Elizabeth Van Zant. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Upjohn Company, Petitioner, vs. The William S. Merrell Chemical Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

320

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Traylor Engineering & Manufacturing Company, Petitioner, vs. Ephraim Lederer, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

330

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Strick Line, Limited, as Owner, etc., Petitioner, vs. A. Suna, Master, etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

414

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The City of Dallas et al., Petitioners, vs. Dallas Telephone Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

415

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Monday, October 17th, 1921, continued.

Philadelphia and Reading Railway Company, Petitioner,
421 vs.
Carl A. Berg.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Catherine Ryan, Petitioner,
425 vs.
Aetna Life Insurance Company of Hartford, Connecticut.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frederick M. Kilmer, Trustee, etc., Petitioner,
431 vs.
Charles H. Keith, Trustee, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Director General of Railroads, Petitioner,
433 vs.
Helen Buschalewski, as Administratrix, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

A. Klipstein & Compa.y, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to
437 vs. the United States Circuit Court of
Garbiss Dilsizian et al. Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pang Hing, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to
438 vs. the United States Circuit Court of
Edward White, Commissioner of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.
Immigration, etc.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Grinnell Overland Company, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari
440 vs. to the Supreme Court of the State of
Merchants National Bank et al. Iowa.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James J. O'Brien, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to
441 vs. the United States Circuit Court of
Walter B. Lashar et al. Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James J. O'Brien, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to
442 vs. the United States Circuit Court of

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John William Henry, Petitioner,
444 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gertrude E. Ponda et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
447 vs.
The City of St. Albans,

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Peninsular Portland Cement Company, Petitioner,
449 vs.
Consolidation Coal Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Detroit Edison Company,
Petitioner,
453 vs.
Jewett Bigelow & Brooks.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that

the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward Kelley et al., Petitioners, vs. West Braddock Bridge Company. 457 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Margaret Ford, as Administratrix, etc. Petitioner, vs. James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, etc. 458 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wabash Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Henry D. Stewart. 461 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hyman Katz et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 462 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, etc., Petitioner,
471 vs.
State Industrial Commission et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Circuit Court of Sangamon County, State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Circuit Court of Sangamon County, State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John A. Savage, Petitioner,
474 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Guayaquil and Quito Railroad Company, Petitioner,
430 vs.
New York and Cuba Mail Steamship Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

It is ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs for failure to file the petition within the statutory time.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Barton Payne, Director General of Railroads, etc., Petitioner,
454 vs.
A. E. Stevens et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

It is ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs for failure to file the petition within the

statutory time.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George Moorehead et al.,
Petitioners,
473 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

It is ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs for failure to file the petition within the statutory time.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Albert Rennie, Plaintiff in Error,
25 vs.
John W. Gibson.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward C. Ward, Plaintiff in Error,
17 vs.
The State of Washington and The Board of Law Examiners of the State of Washington.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

R. D. Langan, R. P. Thompson, F. R. Ballard, et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
171 vs.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

Monday, October 17th, 1921, continued.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Tennessee, Alabama and Georgia Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,
229 vs.
W. M. Drake.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Union Trust Company of San Francisco et al., Executors, etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
236 vs.
Justus S. Wardell, United States Collector, etc., et al.;
and
Harriet L. Levy et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
303 vs.
Justus S. Wardell, United States Collector, etc., et al.

It is ordered by this Court that these cases be reassigned for argument immediately after the case of Victor E. Shwab, Executor, etc., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Emanuel J. Doyle, United States Collector, etc., No. 200, October Term, 1921.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced that the court will take a recess from Monday, the 24th instant, to Monday, November 7th next.

The United States, appellant,
68 vs.
Emil Schoyen, as Administrator,

It is ordered that the appeal to this Court heretofore made by the United States be held in abeyance, on motion of Mr.

Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Lovett, for the appellant.

William Lemke, as Attorney General of North Dakota, et al., Appellants,
456 vs.
The Farmers Grain Company of Embden, North Dakota.

The motion to vacate stay and to advance herein was submitted by Mr. David F. Simpson, for the appellee.

William Lemke, as Attorney General of North Dakota, et al., Appellants,
------ vs.
The Farmers Grain Company of Embden, North Dakota.

The motion to vacate stay and supplemental statement herein was submitted by Mr. David F. Simpson, for the appellee.

William Lemke, as Attorney General of North Dakota, et al., Appellants,
456 vs.
The Farmers Grain Company of Embden, North Dakota.

On motion of Mr. Karl K. Gartner for the appellants, leave is hereby granted appellants to file brief in opposition to motion to vacate stay, within ten days.

William Lemke, as Attorney General of North Dakota, et al., Appellants,
------- vs.
The Farmers Grain Company of Embden, North Dakota.

On motion of Mr. Karl K. Gartner for the appellants, leave is hereby granted appellants to file brief in opposition to motion to vacate stay, within ten days.

The State of North Dakota ex rel. William Lemke, Attorney General,
Complainant,
25, Original. vs.
Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company et al.

The motion to set for argument on the motion to dismiss herein was submitted by Mr. Karl K. Gartner for the complainant.

James J. Rafferty, Collector, etc.,
Petitioner,
138 vs.
Smith, Bell & Company, Limited;

and

James J. Rafferty, as Collector, etc., Petitioner,
140 vs.
Companie General de Tabacos de Filipinas; and

James J. Rafferty, as Collector, etc., Petitioner,
142 vs.
Visayan Refining Company.

On motion of Mr. Charles Marvin in that behalf, it is ordered that these causes be, and the same are hereby, passed, pursuant to the twenty-sixth rule.

Springfield Gas & Electric Company, Plaintiff in Error,
46 vs.
The City of Springfield.

On motion of Mr. B. L. Catron for the defendant in error, leave is hereby granted to file brief herein for the defendant in error.

Railroad Commission of Wisconsin et al., Appellants,
206 vs.
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company.

On motion of Mr. Bruce Scott for the appellee, leave is hereby granted to file additional brief herein for the appellee.

Royal Baking Powder Company, Appellant,
218 vs.
George W. Emerson, Prosecuting Attorney, etc.

The motion to dismiss or affirm herein was submitted by Mr. Richard D. Daniels in behalf of Mr. James Love Hopkins for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. Archibald Cox and Mr. S. W. Fordyce for the appellant in opposition thereto.

F. A. Gillespie, Plaintiff in Error,
322 vs.
The State of Oklahoma.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. James P. Gilmore for the plaintiff in error in support of the motion.

Virginia Railway & Power Company et al., etc., Petitioners,
365 vs.
Bankers Trust Company, Executor,

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Henry W. Anderson and Mr. Thomas B. Gay for the petitioners, and by Mr. James Mann for the respondent.

Virginia Railway & Power Company et al., etc., Petitioners,
366 vs.
Thomas O'Connor et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Henry W. Anderson and Mr. Thomas B. Gay for the petitioners, and by Mr. James Mann for the respondents.

Seth Gettys et al., a partnership, etc., Petitioners,
532 vs.
Silvan Newburger et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. W. A. Ledbetter, Mr. H. L. Stuart, and Mr. R. H. Bell for the petitioners, and by Mr. Bernard Titche, Mr. Henry E. Asp, and Mr. Henry C. Snyder for the respondents.

E. Luther Melin, Petitioner,
539 vs.
Northland Pine Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. E. Luther Melin pro se.

Takuji Yamashita et al., Petitioners,
545 vs.
J. Grant Hinkle, as Secretary of State of the State of Washington.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Corwin S. Shank for the petitioners.

Eibel Process Company, Petitioner,
550 vs.
Minnesota & Ontario Paper Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Frederick P. Fish, Mr. Guy Cunningham, and Mr. Harrison F. Lyman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Amasa C. Paul and Mr. Livingston Gifford for the respondent.

Metallic Rubber Tire Company, Petitioner,
557 vs.
The Hartford Rubber Works Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Henry P. Parmelee and Mr. George D. Watrous for the petitioner, and by Mr. Livingston Gifford and Mr. Charles S. Jones for respondent.

Capitol Life Insurance Company, Plaintiff in Error,
251 vs.
Mary C. Ross.

The motion to dismiss or affirm herein was submitted by Mr. James M. Johnson for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Jules C. Rosenberger and Mr. James C. Jones for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
370 vs.
John Lysaght, Limited.

The motion to dismiss or affirm herein was submitted by Mr. W. Mintzing Post for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Charles A. Boston, Mr. Edgar H. Boles, Mr. George S. Hobart, and Mr. Lindley M. Garrison for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

J. E. Martineau, Chancellor, et al.,
Petitioners,
525 vs.
The State of Arkansas ex rel. Attorney General, et al.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioners to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company,
Petitioner,
43 vs.
Amy Smith.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Gowen Parry for the petitioner, and by Mr. Roscoe R. Koch for the respondent.

Charles F. Hunt, Executor, etc.,
Appellant,
38 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Albert Chester Travis for the appellant, continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Lovett for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Burt E. Barlow for the appellant.

Crescent Cotton Oil Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
41 vs.
The State of Mississippi.

This cause was argued by Mr. J. B. Harris for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Frank Roberson for the defendant in error.

Edward R. Cunningham,
Plaintiff in Error,
42 vs.
James Linn Rodgers et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Clinton Robb for the plaintiff in error.

Tuesday, October 18th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry A. Hegarty, it is ordered that Lloyd L. Evans, Esquire, and John D. McLeran, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hannis Taylor, it is ordered that Hannis Taylor, Jr., Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Harreld, it is ordered that F. A. Rittenhouse, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner,
47 vs.
Beech-Nut Packing Company.

On motion of Mr. Blackburn Esterline on behalf of counsel, it is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed, pursuant to the twenty-sixth rule.

Edward R. Cunningham,
Plaintiff in Error,
42 vs.
James Linn Rodgers et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Clinton Robb for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. William C. Herron for the defendant in error.

and concluded by Mr. George F. Curtis for the plaintiff in error.

Abdul Samad, Appellant,
44 vs.
Henry Behrandt, United States Marshal, etc., et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Harris Taylor for the appellant, and by Mr. William C. Herron for the appellee.

Marine Railway & Coal Co., (Inc.), Plaintiff in Error,
45 vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. James H. Caton for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. H. H. Glassie for the defendant in error.

Wednesday, October 19th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that Simeon Nash, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Bruce Scott, it is ordered that Benjamin W. Scandrett, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. Ralph Burton, it is ordered that Leo J. Brumleve, Jr., Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

John Connors, Plaintiff in Error,
53 vs.
The People of the State of Illinois;

William Taglia, Plaintiff in Error,
89 vs.
The People of the State of Illinois;
and

Abe Schaffner, Plaintiff in Error, 196 vs. The People of the State of Illinois.

It is ordered that these causes be, and the same are hereby, passed, per stipulation.

Springfield Gas & Electric Company, Plaintiff in Error, 46 vs. City of Springfield.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Philip Barton Warren for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. Bayard Lacey Catron for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Joseph S. Clark for the plaintiff in error.

The State of New York et al., Appellants, 283 vs. The United States et al.

On motion of Mr. Alfred P. Thom in that behalf, two counsel are allowed to argue this cause for the railroad companies.

On motion of Mr. Edward G. Griffin for the appellants, four hours are allowed for the argument in this cause. The argument herein was commenced by Mr. Edward G. Griffin for the appellants, continued by Mr. Walter G. Noyes for the railroad companies, by Mr. John E. Benton for the appellants, and by Mr. Patrick J. Farrell for the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, October 20th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas Sterling, it is ordered that Charles M. Stilwill, Esquire, of Sioux City, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Philip P. Campbell, it is ordered that George H. Wark, Esquire, of Caney, and Alfred G. Armstrong, Esquire, of Independence, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Otto H. Kahn et al., as Executors, etc., Appellants,
52 vs.
The United States.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee, it is ordered that this case be passed, pursuant to the twenty-sixth rule.

The State of New York et al., Appellants,
283 vs.
The United States et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Patrick J. Farrell for the Interstate Commerce Commission; by Mr. Alfred P. Thom for the railroad companies; by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the United States; and concluded by Mr. Edward G. Griffin for the appellants.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,

Thursday, October 20th, 1922, continued.

48 vs.

Paul Sachs; and

The United States of

America, Plaintiff in Error,

49 vs.

Herman Janowitz et al.

These cases were argued by Mr. William C. Herron for the plaintiff in error, and submitted by Mr. Joseph A. Seidman for the defendant in error in No. 48, and by Mr. Jonah J. Goldstein for the defendant in error in No. 49.

Kern River Company et al., Appellants,

50 vs.

The United States of America.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. James A. Gibson for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, October 21st, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis Van Devanter,

Mahlon Pitney,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke,

Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Atlee Pomerene, it is ordered that Robert J. Selzer, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Phil D. Swing, it is ordered that L. E. Dadmun, Esquire, of San Diego, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Moorfield Storey, it is ordered that Baxter D. McClain, Esquire, of Iola, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John S. Barker, it is ordered that Francis W. Parker, Jr., Esquire, and Leslie Monroe Parker, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. P. P. Campbell, it is ordered that James A. McDermott, Esquire, of Winfield, State

of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry G. Thomas, it is ordered that George O. Ray, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hatton W. Sumners, it is ordered that Hiram F. Lively, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. B. Hudspeth, it is ordered that G. N. Harrison, of Brownwood, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Joe Ali et al., Appellants,
62 vs.
David Lehrhaupt, Immigration Inspector, etc.

On motion of Mr. Assistant Attorney General Hiter for the appellee, this cause was passed, to await the disposition of case No. 44.

Southern Pacific Railroad Company, Appellant,
60 vs.
Albert B. Fall, Secretary of the Interior, et al.

This case was submitted by Mr. C. F. H. Ogilby for the appellant and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Hiter, and Mr. H. L. Underwood for the appellees.

Kern River Company et al., Appellants,
50 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument herein was continued by Mr. James A. Gibson for the appellants, and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Hiter for the appellee.

Herbert L. Hildreth, Petitioner,
51 vs.
Jim M. Mastoras.

This case was argued by Mr. George P. Dike for the petitioner and submitted by Mr. Joseph L. Atkins for the respondent.

Alabama & Vicksburg Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
55 vs.

This case was argued by Mr. J. Blanc Monroe for the plaintiff in error and submitted by Mr. Robert B. Mayes for the

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, October 24th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas S. Crago, it is ordered that Alfred E. Jones, Esquire, James R. Cray, Esquire, E. D. Brown, Esquire, Joseph J. Baer, Esquire, and William W. Marshall, Esquire, of Uniontown, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chester J. Gerkin, it is ordered that John E. Fetzer, Esquire, of New Rochelle, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. H. Ralston, it is ordered that Harvey F. Carr, Esquire, of Camden, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jo V. Morgan, it is ordered that Bernard S. Barron, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. W. Zevely, it is ordered that Edward H. Chandler, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he

was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. C. Dowell, it is ordered that John B. Clayton Stiver, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. J. Adams, it is ordered that Elisha P. Morcom, Esquire, of Woodburn, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

ORDER.

ORDERED that the bond for $100,000., additional to his official bond, required of the Clerk by order of the Court dated October 4, 1921, and duly executed by him and the Aetna Casualty Company on October 6th, 1921, and approved by the Chief Justice, shall be deposited with the Attorney General for safekeeping.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of Lincoln Gas & Electric Light Company, Petitioner. No. 29, Original, October Term, 1920.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for rehearing herein, and of the petition for rehearing,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and that the said petition for rehearing be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Julius F. Smietanka, Collector, etc., 214 vs. Indiana Steel Company.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the questions certified must be answered in the negative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Dissenting: per Mr. Justice Holmes

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

The State of North Dakota ex rel. William Lemke, Attorney General, Complainant, 25, Original. vs. Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company et al.

On consideration of the motion to set cause for argument on motion to dismiss,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, January 3, 1922, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte, In the matter of Oregon Eilers Music House, Petitioner. --- Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of prohibition herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte Vaughn. --- Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte McKeown. --- Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Royal Baking Powder Company, Appellant, 218 vs. George W. Emerson, Prosecuting Attorney, etc.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Capitol Life Insurance Company, Plaintiff in Error,

351 vs.

Mary C. Ross.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louis Brownlow et al., etc., et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
359 vs.
Mollie Schwartz.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,
370 vs.
John Lysaght, Limited.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, etc., Petitioner,
526 vs.
Roger B. Wood, Trustee, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner,
533 vs.
Fruit Growers' Express, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Julius F. Smietanka, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., Petitioner,
vs.
First Trust & Savings Bank, Trustee, etc.
540

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Takuji Yamashita et al., Petitioners,
vs.
J. Grant Hinkle, as Secretary of State of the State of Washington.
545

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Eibel Process Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Minnesota & Ontario Paper Company.
550

On petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Verde Water and Power Company, Petitioner,
412 vs.
Salt River Valley Water Users' Association et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. C. Townley et al., Petitioners,
475 vs.
The State of Minnesota.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George H. McFadden Brothers Agency et al., Petitioners,
476 vs.
Standard Warehouse and Compress Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Globe & Rutgers Fire Insurance Company, Petitioner,
477 vs.
Walker D. Hines, as Agent, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that

Monday, October 24th, 1921, continued.

Fred W. Weitzel, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to the
482 vs. United States Circuit Court of Appeals for
The United States of America. the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Landis Tool Company et al., On petition for writ of certiorari to the
Petitioners, United States Circuit Court of Appeals for
483 vs. the Third Circuit.
Arthur H. Ingle.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Moritz Loewenthal, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to the
486 vs. United States Circuit Court of Appeals for
The United States of America. the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mexico North Western Railway On petition for writ of certiorari to the
Company, Petitioner, Supreme Court of the State of Texas.
489 vs.
F. L. Williams.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dunkley Company, Petitioner,

California Packing Company. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Rockford Palace Furniture Company, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to the Appellate Court, Second District, of the State of Illinois.

493 vs.

Robert D. Paden.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court, Second District, of the State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Perlman Rim Corporation, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

495 vs. to the United States Circuit Court

Louis deF. Munger. of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of thr argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gould & Curry Mining Company, Petitioner. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court

497 vs. of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

W. G. Douglas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oregon Eilers Music House, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari
509 vs. to the United States Circuit Court
H. W. Sitton, as Trustee, etc. of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Texas Ranger Producing & Refining Company, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari
514 vs. to the United States Circuit Court of
E. T. Robinson. Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. Herman Dierkes, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari
515 vs. to the United States Circuit Court
The United States of America. of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Leopold Harris, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari
516 vs. to the United States Circuit Court
The United States of America. of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alvin M. Muck et al., Petitioners,
504 vs.
Weyerhaeuser Timber Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Erath County, Texas, et al., Petitioners,
507 vs.
Powell, Garard & Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Powell, Garard & Company, Petitioner,
551 vs.
Erath County, Texas, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oregon Eilers Music House, Petitioner,
508 vs.
H. W. Sitton, as Trustee, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

L. W. Wineman et al., etc., Petitioners,
517 vs.
Anderson-Tully Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arminius Chemical Company, Petitioner,
519 vs.
Acme Manufacturing Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry Conlin, Petitioner,
520 vs.
Emma Rose et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the District Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the District Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hector H. Elwell, Petitioner,
522 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. W. Anderson et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 523

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Pacific Company, Petitioner, vs. Industrial Accident Commission of California et al. 529

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry S. DeRees, Petitioner, vs. David Costaguta et al. 531

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

City and County of San Francisco, Petitioner, vs. Postal Telegraph Cable Company. 534

On petition for writ of certiorari to the District Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the District Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dermott Land & Lumber Company,

537 vs. Walter A. Zelnicker Supply Company. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lorraine de la Montanya Crittenden et al., Petitioners, 549 vs. Narcissus Augustus Dorn et al. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. M. Pharr & Sons, Limited, Petitioner, 558 vs. C. D. Kenney Company. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Walker D. Hines, Director General of Railroads, Agent, Petitioner, 559 vs. Anthony Kowalski. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Nichols Field Wilson et al., Petitioners,
576 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Virginia Railway and Power Company et al., Petitioners,
365 vs.
Bankers Trust Company, Executor, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Virginia Railway and Power Company et al., Petitioners,
366 vs.
Thomas O'Connor et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Seth Gettys et al., Petitioners,
532 vs.
Silvan Newburger et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Metallic Rubber Tire Company, Petitioner, vs. The Hartford Rubber Works Company. 557 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. Luther Melin, Petitioner, vs. Northland Pine Company et al. 539 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

It is ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs for failure to file the petition within the statutory time.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joe Dubman, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 547 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

It is ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for failure to file the petition within the statutory time.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Rosalyn Zucht, etc., Petitioner, vs. W. A. King et al. 319 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Fourth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

It is ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Fourth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs for failure to submit the petition in open Court on the motion day as required by Rule 37.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles E. Schaff, Receiver, etc., Petitioner,
332 vs.
Maurice Miller.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

It is ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs for failure to submit the petition in open court on the motion day as required by Rule 37.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

McLane Tilton, Appellant,
334 vs.
Felix M. Drennen, as Receiver, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

It is ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs for failure to submit the petition in open court on the motion day as required by Rule 37.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Liberty Oil Company, Petitioner,
367 vs.
The Condon National Bank.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

It is ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs for failure to submit the petition in open court on the motion day as required by Rule 37.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ole Tolo, Petitioner,
377 vs.
Steamship Hannah Neilson, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

It is ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs for failure to submit the petition in open court on the motion day as required by Rule 37.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sioux City Bridge Company, Petitioner, vs. Dakota County, Nebraska. 381

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

It is ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs for failure to submit the petition in open Court on the motion day as required by Rule 37 .

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Doo Fook, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 434

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

It is ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for failure to submit petition in open Court on the motion day as required by Rule 37.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chan Wy Sheung, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 435

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

It is ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for failure to submit the petition in open Court on the motion day as required by Rule 37.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

P. A. Gillespie, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Oklahoma. 322

It is ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the case is reached for hearing upon the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James A. Baker, Receiver, etc., et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Karl L. Druesedow, Tax Collector, etc. 488

It is ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the case is reached for hearing upon the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Railroad Commission of Wisconsin et al., Appellants,
206 vs.
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company.

It is ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, restored to the docket for reargument, and the cause assigned for hearing on December 5th, 1921, at the head of the call for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

ORDER OF ALLOTMENT OF JUSTICES.

There having been a Chief Justice of this Court appointed since the adjournment of the last term,

It is ordered, That the following allotment be made of the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of this court among the circuits agreeably to the Act of Congress in such case made and provided, and that such allotment be entered of record, viz:

For the First Circuit, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Associate Justice.
For the Second Circuit, Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justice.
For the Third Circuit, Mahlon Pitney, Associate Justice.
For the Fourth Circuit, William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
For the Fifth Circuit, J. C. McReynolds, Associate Justice.
For the Sixth Circuit, William R. Day, Associate Justice.
For the Seventh Circuit, John H. Clarke, Associate Justice.
For the Eighth Circuit, Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justice.
For the Ninth Circuit, Joseph McKenna, Associate Justice.

Julia Boylan et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
111 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to dismiss the writ of error herein was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Hiter for the defendant in error in support of the motion.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
577 vs.
A. C. Loucks et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Hiter for the petitioner.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, 20, Original. vs. The State of Texas.

On motion of Mr. Assistant Attorney General Riter for the United States, the time within which to take testimony herein was extended to November 29 next.

A. Bourjois & Company, Inc., Petitioner, 575 vs. Anna Katzel.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Hans v. Briesen and Mr. William A. Redding for the petitioner, and by Mr. Manton M. Wyvell for the respondent.

A. Bourjois & Company, Inc., Petitioner, 575 vs. Anna Katzel.

On motion of Mr. Hans v. Briesen on behalf of Mr. Lindley M. Garrison, leave is hereby granted to file brief as amicus curiae herein.

Charles S. Davis, Plaintiff in Error, 506 vs. Rena Cooksey and Blanche E. Cooksey.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and Mr. J. S. C. Gallagher, of counsel for the defendants in error, having filed a confession of error and moved the Court to reverse the judgment herein,

It is, therefore, in pursuance of said confession and motion, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Lemke, as Attorney General of North Dakota, et al., Appellants, 456 vs. The Farmers Grain Company of Emmden, North Dakota.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Karl K. Gartner and Mr. William Lemke for the appellants.

Donald M. Hill et al., Petitioners,

510 vs. Charles S. Smith.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Edward E. Blodgett for the petitioners.
John Barton Payne, Director General of Railroads and as Agent, Petitioner, 511 vs. Leila Shotwell, as Administratrix, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Frederic B. Scott for the petitioner.
James Cox Davis, Director General of Railroads, and as Agent, Petitioner, 538 vs. Edward O. Colvin.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr.P.H. Van Alstine and Mr. H. J. Killilea for the petitioner.
John Barton Payne, Director General of Railroads for the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, etc., Petitioner, 588 vs. Catherine Lind, Administratrix,etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. George Hoadly, Mr. Edward Colston, and Mr.Judson Harmon for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward M.Ballard for the respondent.
John Barton Payne, Director General of Railroads,etc., 589 vs. Petitioner, Catherine Lind, Administratrix,etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. George Hoadly, Mr. Edward Colston, and Mr.Judson Harmon for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward M.Ballard for the respondent.
Gertrude E. Fonda et al., etc., et al., Plaintiffs in Error, 447 vs. The City of St. Albans.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Vermont.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiffs in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, November 7 next, at 12 o'clock.

Monday, November 7, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that Lincoln L. Eyre, Esquire, and Francis J. Maneely, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania; and Louis S. Carpenter, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hiram W. Johnson, it is ordered that John P. O'Brien, Esquire, William E. C. Mayer, Esquire, and Edgar J. Kohler, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel A. Ettelson, it is ordered that Frederic C. Rupp, Esquire, of Buffalo, and Robert J.Moore, Esquire, of Niagara Falls, State of New York, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Park Trammell, it is ordered that Bart. A. Riley, Esquire, of Miami, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry L. Myers, it is ordered that Earle N. Genzberger, Esquire, and Francis A. Silver, Esquire, of Butte, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas N. McCran, it is ordered that George L. Record, Esquire, of Jersey City, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert H. McCarter, it is ordered that Richard Francis Jones, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that Benjamin Cianciarulo, Esquire, of Providence, Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Herron, it is ordered that Henry A. Bundschu, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. W. Bride, it is ordered that Charles E. Kelley, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frans E. Lindquist, it is ordered that Arthur C. Minning, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis W. Clements, it is ordered that George Reed, Esquire, of Fayetteville, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ewing H.

Scott, it is ordered that Nathaniel Vigran, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert N. Miller, it is ordered that Bertram Winthrop, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles P. Ford, it is ordered that Charles Morris Roberson, Esquire, of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

William Breiholz, Edward Korf,
Joseph Stuart, et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error, In Error to the Supreme Court of the State
23 vs. of Iowa.
The Board of Supervisors of
Pocahontas County, Iowa, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds concurs in the result).

Charles F. Hunt, Executor of the
Estate of William Weighel, deceased,
38 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.
The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims for further proceedings in

conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Alabama & Vicksburg Railway Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error, 55 vs. Smith Journey.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Alabama & Vicksburg Railway Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error, 55 vs. Smith Journey.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Alabama & Vicksburg Railway Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error, 55 vs. Smith Journey.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Louisiana & Pine Bluff Railway Company, Appellant, 291 vs. The United States of America.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from

the District Court of the United States for the western District of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Citizens National Bank of Cincinnati, Administrator with the Will Annexed of the Estate of John M. Anderson, deceased, Plaintiff in Error,
27 vs.
Peter W. Durr, as Former Auditor, et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

(Additional opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes, concurred in by Mr. Justice Van Devanter and Mr. Justice McReynolds.)

Citizens National Bank of Cincinnati, Administrator with the Will Annexed of the Estate of John M. Anderson, deceased, Plaintiff in Error,
27 vs.
Peter W. Durr, as former Auditor, et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

(Additional opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes, concurred in by Mr. Justice Van Devanter and Mr. Justice McReynolds.)

Citizens National Bank of Cincinnati, Administrator with the Will Annexed of the Estate of John M. Anderson, deceased, Plaintiff in Error,
27 vs.

Peter W. Durr, as former Auditor,
et al.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

(Additional opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes, concurred in by Mr. Justice Van Devanter and Mr. Justice McReynolds.)

Peter Wilson, Plaintiff in Error,
21 vs.
Republic Iron and Steel Company
and Warner Stinson.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Alabama.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Alabama, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Joseph W. Nicholas, Appellant,
10 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Wilson Scott Norris, Appellant,
11 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the

Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Louis Eberlein, Appellant,
12 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.
The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Pennsylvania Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
210 vs. In Error to the United States Circuit
Isaac C. Weber, Surviving Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.
Partner of W. J. Jacoby and
Isaac C. Weber, copartners,
trading under the firm name of
W. F. Jacoby & Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Marine Railway and Coal Company,
Inc., Plaintiff in Error, In Error to the Court of Appeals of the
45 vs. District of Columbia.
The United States of America.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the

Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Springfield Gas & Electric Company, Plaintiff in Error,
46 vs.
The City of Springfield.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
48 vs.
Paul Sacks.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
49 vs.
Herman Janowitz et al.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Company, et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The City of Clarksdale. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

15

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The City of Clarksdale.

15

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The City of Clarksdale.

15

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Herbert L. Hildreth, Petitioner,
51 vs.
Jim M. Mastoras.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Liberty Oil Company, Petitioner,
367 vs.
The Condon National Bank et al.

Ole Tolo, Petitioner,
377 vs.
Steamship "Hannah Neilson", etc.

Sioux City Bridge Company, Petitioner,
381 vs.
Dakota County, Nebraska.

Doo Fook, Petitioner,
434 vs.
The United States of America.

Chan Wy.Sheung, Petitioner,
435 vs.
The United States of America.

These were petitions for a rehearing of the dismissal of petitions for certiorari which were not submitted to the Court in accordance with the provision of Rule 37, Par. 4, that "An application for a writ of certiorari will be deemed in time when the petition therefor, accompanied by the printed record and brief, is filed within the period prescribed by law, provided this is followed by submitting the petition in open court on some motion day not later than the first one which follows a period of four weeks after such filing". It has been made to appear to the satisfaction of the Court that the failure to submit these petitions at the proper time was due to a misunderstanding as to the effect of the rule and an unwarranted reliance upon the assumed practice of the Clerk of his own motion to present such petitions. The authority given by the rule to the Clerk to present the petitions at the request of counsel was for the purpose of relieving counsel of the necessity of coming to court, frequently from long distances, to make a formal motion. It was not, however,

intended to relax the requirement adopted to facilitate dispatch of business, that the petition should be presented on the motion day fixed by the rule. By granting these motions, the court does not intend to relax the requirements of the rule, and suggests that hereafter, to avoid question, requests made to the Clerk to present such petitions should be in writing. The applications in the foregoing cases are severally granted, and the petitions will be restored to the docket for consideration on their merits and considered as submitted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Lemke, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants, 456 vs. The Farmers Grain Company of Embden, North Dakota.

It is ordered by this Court that the consideration of the motion to vacate the stay and writ of supersedeas herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the case on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Lemke, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants, 604 vs. Homer Farmers Elevator Company et al.

It is ordered by this Court that the consideration of the motion to vacate the stay and writ of supersedeas herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the case on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Lemke, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants, 456 vs. The Farmers Grain Company of Embden, North Dakota.
William Lemke, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants, 604 vs. Homer Farmers Elevator Company et al.

On consideration of the motions to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by this Court that said motions be, and the same are hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, November 14th next, at the head of the call for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Great Northern Railway Company, Petitioner,

Vivian H. Steinke et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Donald M. Hill et al., etc., Petitioners,
510 vs.
Charles S. Smith.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. Bourjois & Company, Inc., Petitioner,
575 vs.
Anna Katzel.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
577 vs.
A. C. Loucks et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James Cox Davis, Director General of Railroads, etc., Petitioner,
538 vs.
Edward O. Colvin.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Barton Payne, Director General of Railroads, etc., Petitioner,
588 vs.
Catherine Lind, Administratrix, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of Hamilton County, Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of Hamilton County, Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied, because prematurely filed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Barton Payne, Director General of Railroads, etc., Petitioner,
589 vs.
Catherine Lind, Administratrix, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of Hamilton County, Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of Hamilton County, Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied, because prematurely filed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, Plaintiff in Error,
355 vs.

John E. Sullivan.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

In Re Whitehead. NO.---

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein, on appeal from an order of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York refusing a writ of habeas corpus,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, for lack of jurisdiction to entertain the appeal.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company, Petitioner,

43 vs.

Amy Smith.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Abdul Samad, Appellant,

44 vs.

Henry Behrandt, United States Marshal, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Julia Boylan and Anna Silver Moyer, Plaintiffs in Error,
111 vs.
The United States of America.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Appellant,
608 vs.
G. M. Caster et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United Shoe Machinery Corporation et al., Appellants,
119 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, January 3rd next, on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee.

The United States, Appellant,
410 vs.
Mason & Hanger Company.

A motion for an order on the Court of Claims to make and certify specific finding of fact was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Lovett and Mr. John H. Hoover for the appellant in support of the motion.

The United States, Appellant,
410 vs.
Mason & Hanger Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari and suggestion of diminution of the record was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Lovett, and Mr. John H. Hoover for the appel-

and Mr. George R. Shields for the appellee in opposition thereto.

The City of Louisville
592 vs.
Louisville Railway Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Richard P. Ernst in behalf of counsel.

Oscar Leser et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
553 vs.
J. Mercer Garnett et al., etc., et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. William L. Marbury for the plaintiffs in error.

Charles S. Fairchild, Appellant,
148 vs.
Charles E. Hughes, Secretary of State, et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. William L. Marbury for the appellant. The motion to hold consideration of motion to advance in abeyance was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellees.

Tom J. Terral, as Secretary of State of Arkansas, Appellant,
93 vs.
Burke Construction Company.

The motion to amend the record in this cause was submitted by Mr. Kenneth McKellar in that behalf.

Board of Public Utility Commissioners of the State of New Jersey, Appellant,
607 vs.
Public Service Railway Company.

The motion for an order staying operation of preliminary injunction was submitted by Mr. Thomas F. McCran for the appellant, with leave to make oral argument thereon.

Ex Parte, In the Matter of Brady W. Warner, Petitioner.
NO. ----, Original.

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted by Mr. Frans E. Lindquist for the petitioner.

Joshua W. Miles, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
416 vs.
The Safe Deposit & Trust Company of Baltimore, Guardian, etc.

The motion to advance herein was submitted by Mr. Arthur W. Machen, Jr., for the defendant in error.

Oregon Eilers Music House,
Petitioner,
508-509 vs.
H. W. Sitton, as Trustee, etc.;
and,
Ex Parte: In the Matter of
Oregon Eilers Music House,
--,Original. Petitioner.

The motion that there issue forthwith certified copies of orders denying petitions for writs of certiorari and of motion for leave to file petition for writ of prohibition, was submitted by Mr. Levi Cooke for the petitioner, and by Mr. Will H. King for the respondent in opposition thereto.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
20, Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

On motion of Mr. Frederick S. Tyler in that behalf, the Report of the Special Master herein was filed.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
20, Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

On motion of Mr. Frederick S. Tyler in that behalf, the Report of the Commissioner herein was filed.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
20,Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

On motion of Mr. John S. Flannery of counsel for the Receiver, the sixth Report of the Receiver herein was filed.

John Barton Payne, Director General, etc., et al.,
Appellants,
329 vs.
George Wallace et al.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, was substituted as a party appellant herein instead of John Barton Payne, on motion of Mr. Alexander Britton in behalf of counsel. The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Alexander Britton in behalf of counsel.

The State of North Dakota ex rel.
William Lemke, Attorney General,
Complainant,
25, Original. vs.
Chicago & Northwestern Railway
Company et al.

The motion that the order setting case for hearing on January 3, 1922, be canceled, that case be submitted on briefs, and that the motion to dismiss herein be denied, was submitted by Mr. Karl E. Gartner for the complainant, with leave to counsel for the defendants to file brief in opposition thereto.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,
369 vs.
Allied Machinery Company of America.

The motion to dismiss or affirm herein was submitted by Mr. Hartwell Cabell for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Edgar H. Boles, Mr. Charles A. Boston, Mr. George S. Hobart, and Mr. Lindley M. Garrison for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

The City of Chicago, Plaintiff in Error,
61 vs.
Chicago Railways Company et al.

The motion for leave to file brief of James L. Quackenbush as amicus curiae herein was submitted by Mr. Louis S. Carpenter in that behalf. The motion for leave to reply thereto on behalf of the City of New York was submitted by Mr. Hiram W. Johnson in that behalf.

James S. McKee et al., Petitioners,
282 vs.
Benjamin Gratz.

On motion of Mr. Frank M. Swacker in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief herein as amicus curiae.

The State of New York et al., Appellants,
283 vs.
The United States et al.

The motion for leave to file supplemental brief herein was submitted by Mr. John H. Benton for the appellants.

The United States of America, Appellant,
256 vs.
The Western Union Telegraph Company.

On motion of Mr. Paul E. Leak for the appellee, extension of time of one month within which to file briefs in this cause was granted.

Oscar Leser et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
553 vs.
J. Mercer Garnett et al., etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William L. Marbury for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition, and by Mr. Alexander Armstrong for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

Carlos L. Byron et al., Petitioners,
565 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William Robert Andrews, Mr. S. H. Piles, and Mr. C. A. Keigwin for the petitioners, and by Mr.

Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Grim, and Mr. Wm. C. Herron for the respondent.

Robert H. Davis, Petitioner,
567 vs.
American Engineering Company et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Robert H. McCarter for the petitioner, and by Mr. Alfred T. Davison, Mr. Frederick T. Kelsey and Mr. Oscar A. Lewis for the respondents.

The City of New York,
Petitioner,
568 vs.
Title Guarantee and Trust Company, Trustee, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John F. O'Brien for the petitioner, and by Mr. Alfred T. Davison and Mr. Oscar A. Lewis for the respondents.

Farmers Life Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
580 vs.
Foster Building and Realty Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Lewis H. Bryan, Mr. Henry A. Hicks, and Mr. B. D. Tarlson for the petitioner, and by Mr. C. M. McWilliams for the respondents.

Farmers Life Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
581 vs.
Foster Building and Realty Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Lewis H. Bryan, Mr. Henry A. Hicks, and Mr. B. D. Tarlson for the petitioner, and by Mr. C. M. McWilliams for the respondent.

Star Company, Petitioner,
584 vs.
The Wheeler Syndicate (Inc.)

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William A. DeFord and Mr. Nathan Burkan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles E. Kelley for the respondent.

Star Company, Petitioner,
585 vs.
Harry C. Fisher.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William A. DeFord and Mr. Nathan Burkan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles E. Kelley for the respondent.

Daniel Boyle et al., Appellants,
36 vs.
A. M. Holter Hardware Company et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Montana.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective

parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John W. Davidge, Petitioner,
58 vs.
Leo Simmons.

It is ordered that this case be passed until No. 79 is reached.

North Pacific Steamship Company, Appellant,
63 vs.
William T. Soley.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Ernest Clewe and Mr. Frank W. Aitken for the appellant, and by Mr. Christopher M. Bradley for the appellee.

The Robert Mitchell Furniture Company, Plaintiff in Error,
56 vs.
Selden Breck Construction Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Leo J. Brumleve for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Simeon Nash for the defendant in error.

Board of Public Utility Commissioners of the State of New Jersey, Appellant,
607 vs.
Public Service Railway Company.

Twenty minutes were allowed each side for the argument of the motion for stay of preliminary injunction. The motion was argued by Mr. Thomas F. McCran and Mr. L. Edward Herrmann for the appellant, and by Mr. Robert H. McCarter for the appellee.

Tuesday, November 8th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank L. Crawford, it is ordered that Arthur E. Young, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Milton D. Purdy, it is ordered that Joel M. Dickey, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Addison T. Smith, it is ordered that Albert C. Hindman, Esquire, of Ancon, Canal Zone, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. G. Mathews, it is ordered that John T. Simms, Esquire, of Charleston, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America
ex rel. Robert A. Widenmann,
Plaintiff in Error,

92 vs.

Bainbridge Colby, as Secretary
of State, etc.

It is ordered that Charles E. Hughes, present Secretary of State, be, and he is hereby, substituted as the party defendant in error herein in place of Bainbridge Colby, former Secretary of State, on motion of Mr. Richard S. Harvey in that behalf. The appearance of Richard S. Harvey as counsel for the plaintiff in error herein is withdrawn, and the appearance of George W. Tucker substituted, on motion of Mr. Richard S. Harvey in that behalf.

International Railway Company,
Appellant,
340 vs.
George G. Davidson, individually and as Collector, etc., et al.;
and
Thomas Snyder, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated,
Appellant,
368 vs.
George G. Davidson, Jr., individually, etc., et al.

The motion to advance and consolidate these cases was submitted by Mr.George F. Snyder in that behalf.

International Railway Company,
Appellant,
340 vs.
George G. Davidson, individually and as Collector, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. George F. Snyder in behalf of Mr. Basil Robillard for the appellant in support of the petition.

John Simmons Company, Petitioner,
57 vs.
The Grier Brothers Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. James Q. Rice for the petitioner, and by Mr. C. B. Byrnes and Mr. David A. Reed for the respondent.

C. E. Miller, Plaintiff in Error,
59 vs.
American Bonding Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. James C. Glessner for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Francis B. Bracken for the defendant in error.

The City of Chicago, Plaintiff in Error,
61 vs.

Chicago Railways Company et al.

The motion for leave to file briefs herein as amici curiae, heretofore submitted, was denied. The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Chester E. Cleveland for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, November 9th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chester E. Cleveland, it is ordered that Elias V. Rosenkranz, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The City of Chicago,
Plaintiff in Error,
61 vs.
Chicago Railways Company et al.

The argument herein was continued by Mr. Harry P. Weber for the defendants in error, and was concluded by Mr. Chester E. Cleveland for the plaintiff in error.

The Eureka Pipe Line Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
255 vs.
Walter S. Hallanan, State Tax Commissioner, et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Frank L. Crawford for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. F. O. Blue and Mr. S. B. Avis for the defendants in error.

United Fuel Gas Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
276 vs.
Walter S. Hallanan, State Tax Commissioner, etc., et al.

The argument herein was commenced by Mr. Malcolm Jackson for the plaintiff in error, and was continued by Mr. William Gordon Mathews for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made the Court in

Thursday, November 10th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Houston Thompson, it is ordered that William A. Needham, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ernest Wilkinson, it is ordered that F. Gwynn Gardiner, Esquire, and Raymond J. Mawhinney, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Humphrey, it is ordered that William Jennings Coyle, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles L. McNary, it is ordered that Cicero F. Hogan, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Marvin Jones, it is ordered that Ernest O. Thompson, Esquire, of Amarillo, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he

was sworn accordingly.

Essanay Film Manufacturing Company, Appellant,

70 vs.

William H. Kane.

This case was submitted by Mr. William M. Seabury for the appellant. There was no appearance for the appellee.

United Fuel Gas Company, Plaintiff in Error,

276 vs.

Walter S. Hallanan, State Tax Commissioner, etc., et al.

James J. Rafferty, Collector, etc., Petitioner,

138 vs.

Smith, Bell & Company, Limited;

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. William Gordon Mathews for the defendants in error, and was concluded by Mr. Malcolm Jackson for the plaintiff in error.

James J. Rafferty, as Collector, etc., Petitioner,

140 vs.

Compania General de Tabacos de Filipinas; and

James J. Rafferty, as Collector, etc., Petitioner,

142 vs.

Visayan Refining Company.

These cases were argued by Mr. Grant T. Trent for the petitioner, and by Mr. C. B. Miller for the respondents.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner,

47 vs.

Beech-Nut Packing Company.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, November 14th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. A. Ledbetter, it is ordered that J. B. Moore, Esquire, of Ardmore, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Miles Poindexter, it is ordered that Ralph H. Higgins, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Bergen, it is ordered that Edmund W. Wakelee, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Max C. Cohen, it is ordered that Samuel Meyers, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

(The following admission of Walace Hawkins, Esq., was canceled. See Minutes, April 11, 1922.)

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom L. Beauchamp, it is ordered that Walace Hawkins, Esquire, of Austin, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court,

and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George W. Norris, it is ordered that Frank A. Harrison, Esquire, of Lincoln, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, it is ordered that Ewell D. Moore, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David F. Simpson, it is ordered that Seth W. Richardson, Esquire, of Fargo, State of North Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney andcounsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. P. Freeling, it is ordered that Wendell Johnson, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, and Courtland M. Penquay, Esquire, of Chandler, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John F. O'Brien, it is ordered that M. Maldwin Fortig, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wilber W. Chambers, it is ordered that Clarence R. Cummings, Esquire, of White Plains, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles A. Vilas, it is ordered that Samuel P. Moran, Esquire, and William L. Hansom, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Crescent Cotton Oil Company,

Plaintiff in Error,

The State of Mississippi.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

(Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice McReynolds concur in the result.)

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Ex Parte, In the matter of
Brady W. Warner, Petitioner.
No.---, Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Appellant,
410 vs.
Mason & Hanger Company.

On consideration of the motion for an order on the Court of Claims to make and certify specific findings of fact herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Tom J. Terral, as Secretary of State of The State of Arkansas, Appellant,
93 vs.
Burke Construction Company.

On consideration of the motion for leave to amend the record herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of North Dakota
ex rel. William Lemke, Attorney General, Complainant,
25, Original. vs.

Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company et al.

On consideration of the motion that the order heretofore entered setting this case for hearing be canceled, and that this case be submitted on briefs, and that the motion to dismiss herein be denied,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Board of Public Utility Commissioners of the State of New Jersey, Appellant,
607 vs.
Public Service Railway Company.

On consideration of the motion for stay of the injunction herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,
369 vs.
Allied Machinery Company of America.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles S. Fairchild, Appellant,
148 vs.
Charles E. Hughes, Secretary of State, et al.; and
Oscar Leser et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
553 vs.
J. Mercer Garnett et al., etc., et al.

On consideration of the motions to advance these cases,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, December 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day; to be heard together, and the motion to

dismiss to be heard at the same time.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joshua W. Miles, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., Plaintiff in Error,
416 vs.
The Safe Deposit & Trust Company of Baltimore, Guardian, etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Director General, etc., et al., Appellants,
329 vs.
George Wallace et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The City of Louisville
592 vs.
Louisville Railway Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

International Railway Company, Appellant,
340 vs.
George G. Davidson, Jr., Individually, etc., et al.; and
Thomas Snyder, on behalf of himself, etc., Appellant,
368 vs.
George G. Davidson, Jr., Individually, etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases,
It is now here ordered by this Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, December 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Liberty Oil Company, Petitioner, vs. The Condon National Bank et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

367

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sioux City Bridge Company, Petitioner, vs. Dakota County, Nebraska. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

381

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Studebaker Corporation, Petitioner, vs. Gear Grinding Machine Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

358

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Barton Payne, Director General of Railroads, etc., Petitioner, vs. Leila Shotwell, as Administratrix, etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

511

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ole Tolo, Petitioner,
377 vs.
Steamship "Hannah Neilson", etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Carlos L. Byron et al.,
Petitioners,
565 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert H. Davis, Petitioner,
567 vs.
American Engineering Company
et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The City of New York,
Petitioner,
568 vs.
Title Guarantee & Trust
Company, Trustee, etc.,
et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that

the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Farmers Life Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
580 vs.
Foster Building & Realty Company et al.; and
Farmers Life Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
581 vs.
Foster Building & Realty Company et al.

On petition for writs of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Star Company, Petitioner,
584 vs.
The Wheeler Syndicate, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Star Company, Petitioner,
585 vs.
Harry C. Fisher.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

International Railway Company,
Appellant,

George G. Davidson, Individually
and as Collector, etc., et al.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing on the appeal.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oscar Loser et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
553 vs.
J. Mercer Garnett et al.,
etc., et al.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Appellant,
410 vs.
Mason & Hanger Company.

On consideration of the motion for a writ of certiorari herein upon suggestion of diminution of the record,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced that the Court will take a recess from Monday, the 21st instant, until Monday, December 5, next.

Astoria Marine Iron Works,
Plaintiff in Error,
376 vs.
United States Shipping Board
Emergency Fleet Corporation.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the defendant in error.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
20, Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

On motion of Mr. W. A. Ledbetter in that behalf, leave was granted to file amendment to amended petition of intervention of A. E. Pearson et al.

Walter A. Bastes,
Appellant,
548 vs.
George P. Crutchley, Collector,
etc., et al.

The motion to advance this cause for hearing with cases Nos. 174, 175 and 428, heretofore assigned for Monday, December 5 next, was submitted by Mr. Frank E. Lindquist in that behalf.

Railroad Commission of Wisconsin et al., Appellants,
206 vs.
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company.

On motion of Mr. Karl K. Gartner for the State of North Dakota, leave was granted to file brief herein as amicus curiae, with leave to opposing parties to file reply.

The Texas Cherokees, Complainant,
---, Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

The motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein was submitted by Mr. William Sulzer for the complainant.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner,
47 vs.
Beech-Nut Packing Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Charles W. Dunn for the respondent, and was concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner.

William Lemke, as Attorney General of North Dakota, et al., Appellants,
456 vs.
The Farmers Grain Company of Embden, North Dakota.

This case was argued by Mr. Seth W. Richardson for the appellants, and by Mr. David F. Simpson for the appellee.

William Lemke, as Attorney General of the State of North Dakota, et al., Appellants,
604 vs.
The Homer Farmers Elevator Company et al.

This case was submitted by Mr. William Lemke, Mr. Karl K. Gartner, and Mr. Seth W. Richardson for the appellants, and by Mr. William A. Lancaster, Mr. David F. Simpson, and Mr. Harold C. Simpson for the appellees. Leave was granted to file further briefs hereafter.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, November 15th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William W. Moss, it is ordered that Edward A. Stockwell, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

John Hill, Jr., et al., Appellants,
616 vs.
Henry C. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture, et al.

The motion to advance this cause and for an order preserving the status quo was submitted by Mr. Henry S. Robbins for the appellants.

Charles P. Hunt, Executor, etc., Appellant,
38 vs.
The United States.

The mandate herein was granted on motion of Mr. Burt E. Barlow for the appellant.

Otto H. Kahn et al., as Executors, etc., Appellants,
52 vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. H. T. Newcomb for the appellants and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Ottinger for the appellee.

Leopold Stemberger et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,

64 vs.
The Continental Mines, Power &
Reduction Company.

This case was submitted by Mr. Norton Montgomery for the plaintiffs in error and by Mr. Morrison Shafroth for the defendant in error.

The State of Texas, Appellant,
298 vs.
Eastern Texas Railroad Company
et al.; and

The State of Texas et al.,
Appellants,
563 vs.
The United States of America
et al.

Four hours were allowed for the argument of these cases. The argument was commenced by Mr. Tom L. Beauchamp for the appellants, and was continued by Mr. E. B. Perkins for the appellees railroad companies, by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee The United States, and by Mr. Walter McFarland for appellee the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, November 16th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that I. Faerber Goldenhorn, Esquire, of Jersey City, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. P. Freeling, it is ordered that James Smith Ross, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl H. Chindblom, it is ordered that Solomon P. Roderick, Esquire, and Michael B. Roderick, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, and John Christenson, Esquire, of Cicero, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rufus S. Day, it is ordered that Nicholas M. Greenberger, Esquire, of Akron, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Texas, Appellant,
298 vs.

Eastern Texas Railroad Company et al.;

and

The State of Texas, Appellant,

563 vs.

The United States of America et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the United States, leave is hereby granted to file brief within one week.

The State of Texas, Complainant,
24, Original. vs.
The Interstate Commerce Commission et al.

The motion to set this case for hearing was granted, and the case was assigned for hearing on Monday, December 5, next, immediately after No. 206, on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the United States.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
20, Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

The motion to reassign hearing on certain interventions herein, and request that the case be reset following hearing on the main boundary case were submitted by Mr. S. P. Freeling for the complainant.

The State of Texas, Appellant,
298 vs.
Eastern Texas Railroad Company et al.; and

The State of Texas, Appellant,
563 vs.
The United States of America et al.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Walter McFarland for the appellee, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and was concluded by Mr. Tom L. Beauchamp for the appellant.

Cornelius C. Watts et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
66 vs.
The State of Arizona ex rel.
Ignatius Burgoon, Treasurer, etc.

The argument herein was commenced by Mr. Samuel L. Kingan for the plaintiffs in error, continued by Mr. Leslie C. Hardy for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey for the plaintiffs in error.

Renssolaer L. Curtis, Receiver, etc.,
Appellant,
69 vs.

John J. Conoly et al.

The argument herein was commenced by Mr. E. F. McClennen for the appellant, and continued by Mr. William W. Moss for the appellees.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, November 17th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur M. Allen, it is ordered that Felix Hebert, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. M.Baldwin Fertig, it is ordered that Asher Blum, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Vaile, it is ordered that John L. Stivers, Esquire, of Montrose, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Eastman Jones, a minor, etc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
72 vs.
H. O. Seiffert et al.

This case was submitted by Mr. W. F. Semple and Mr. W. E. Utterback for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. W. Y. Dilley and Mr. C. S. Arnold for the defendants in error.

Rennselaer L. Curtis, Receiver, etc.,
Appellant,
69 vs.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. William W. Moss for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Arthur M. Allen for

Thursday, November 17th, 1921, continued.

The Central Railroad Company of New Jersey et al., Appellants,
436 vs.
The United States of America et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Henry Wolfe Biklo for the appellants, continued by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for The United States, by Mr. Walter McFarland for The Interstate Commerce Commission, and concluded by Mr. Alexander H. Elder for the appellants.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants,
257 vs.
Consolidated Gas Company of New York;
Consolidated Gas Company of New York, Appellant,
258 vs.
Charles D. Newton, Attorney General, etc., et al.; and
Consolidated Gas Company of New York, Appellant,
288 vs.
Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al.

Five and one-half hours were allowed for the oral argument of these cases. The argument was commenced by Mr. John A. Garver for the Consolidated Gas Company.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, November 18th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Buchner, it is ordered that John G. O'Reilly, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Francis Carusi, it is ordered that Roger O'Donnell, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jesse Andrews, it is ordered that Walter H. Walne, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis C. Wilson, it is ordered that Eugene Perry Smith, Esquire, of San Diego, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr.Samuel P. Moran, it is ordered that Travis H. Whitney, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney
General, etc., et al., Appellants,

257 vs.

Consolidated Gas Company of New York;

Consolidated Gas Company of New York,
Appellant,

258 vs.

Charles D. Newton, Attorney General,
etc., et al., and

Consolidated Gas Company of New York,
Appellant,

288 vs.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney
General, etc., et al.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Wilbur W. Chambers for Newton, Attorney General; by Mr. John P. O'Brien for Swann, District Attorney, etc.; and was concluded by Mr. William L. Ransom for the Consolidated Gas Company.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, November 21st, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that Robert Ash, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; Russell C. Leffingwell, Esquire, of New York City, and Ellis Ames Ballard, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter F. Rogers, it is ordered that George M. Dowe, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Phil D. Swing, it is ordered that Harry T. Dewhirst, Esquire, of Benton Harbor, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. H. Carraway, it is ordered that Edward F. McFaddin, Esquire, and Tilman B. Parks, Esquire, of Hope, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John L. Rich,

be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert C. Hayden, it is ordered that George W. Dalzell, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi Cooke, it is ordered that W. D. Stewart, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert H. Lovett, it is ordered that Edward P. Unger, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick C.Bryan, it is ordered that Albert T. Morgan, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. J. Adams, it is ordered that J. Hawkins Napier, Esquire, of Woodsport, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. W. Gregory, it is ordered that Greer McInnis Maréchal, Esquire, of Dayton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry P. Creed, it is ordered that Joseph Matthew Rault, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James C. Crawford, it is ordered that John S. Macbeth, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he

was sworn accordingly.

The United States, Appellant,
260 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.
C. W. Phellis.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims with directions to dismiss the suit.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds,
Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

John D. Rockefeller, Plaintiff in Error,
535 vs.
The United States of America. In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds,
Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The New York Trust Company and Edith Hale Harkness, Executors of the last will and testament of William L. Harkness, deceased, Plaintiffs in Error,
536 vs.
William H. Edwards, Collector of United States Internal Revenue for the Second In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds,
Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Kern River Company et al.,
Appellants,
50 vs.
The United States of America.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, modified so as to conform to the opinion of this Court, and, as so modified, is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California with directions to enter a decree for the United States in accordance with the opinion of this Court, and for further proceedings consistent therewith.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

John Horstmann Company, Appellant,
26 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Natron Soda Company, Appellant,
32 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.
The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the court:

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants,
295 vs.
The Kings County Lighting Company;
and
Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants,
296 vs.
New York & Queens Gas Company.

It is ordered by this Court that these cases be, and the same are hereby, reassigned for argument on Tuesday, January 3d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oregon Eilers Music House, Petitioner,
508 vs.
H. W. Sitton, as Trustee, etc.;

Oregon Eilers Music House, Petitioner,
509 vs.
H. W. Sitton, as Trustee, etc.;
and
Ex parte In the matter of Oregon Eilers Music House, Petitioner.
--- Original.

On consideration of the motion that certified copies of orders denying petitions for writs of certiorari and motion for leave to file petition for writ of prohibition, issue at once, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Lemke, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants,
456 vs.
The Farmers Grain Company of Rubbin

On consideration of the motion to vacate the stay and writ of supersedeas herein, It is now here ordered by this

Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, without prejudice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Lemke, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants,
604 vs.
Homer Farmers Elevator Company et al.

On consideration of the motion to vacate the stay and writ of supersedeas herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, without prejudice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Walter A. Eastes, Appellant,
548 vs.
George F. Crutchley, Collector, etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 5th next, to be heard with Nos. 174, 175 and 428, as one case.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Texas-Cherokees and Associate Bands, Complainant,
--- Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file an original bill of complaint herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Hill, Jr., et al., Appellants,
616 vs.
Henry C. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture, etc., et al.

ORDER.

The motion to advance herein is granted, and the cause is set for January 3, 1922, after the cases specially set for that day; and it is ordered, the appellees not objecting, that the Board of Trade of the City of Chicago and its directors, appellees, are restrained from seeking or accepting from the Secretary of Agriculture a designation of said board of trade as a "contract market" under the act of Congress approved August 24, 1921, entitled "The future trading act", or from admitting to membership in said board any representative of any cooperative association of producers as required by

said act, or from modifying its rules or by-laws, as required by said future trading act, in order to entitle said board of trade to be designated as a "contract market", and from otherwise complying with the terms of said act prior to the final judgment of the court herein.

Also, that during the pendency of said cause in this court and for twenty (20) days after final judgment herein the appellees, Henry C. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture of the United States; David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue of the United States; Charles F. Clyne, United States District Attorney for the Northern District of Illinois; and John C. Cannon, Collector of Internal Revenue for the First District of Illinois, and each of their successors in office, are restrained from collecting, or attempting to collect, by suit, criminal prosecution, or otherwise, from appellants, or any other member of said board of trade, any tax or penalty which may have accrued or been incurred under said future trading act, or from taking during said period any other steps against said Board of Trade or any of its members to enforce or compel their compliance with, or punish for noncompliance with, any of the provisions of said trading act.

This order is made upon condition that within ten (10) days herefrom the appellants execute unto the appellees herein and file in this cause a good and sufficient bond in the sum of twenty-five thousand dollars ($25,000.), with sureties to be approved by the Clerk of this Court, and conditioned that the appellants will promptly pay any and all damages which may be suffered by the appellees herein, or any of them, by reason of the granting or continuance of this order, if it is ultimately adjudged that the said future trading act is a valid act in whole or in part.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
20, Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

On consideration of the motion to reassign the case as to interveners, and that case be reset to follow main boundary case,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
20, Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

ORDER.

and to charge the same as expenses of the receivership:

To Nagel & Kirby the sum of six thousand dollars as compensation for services rendered by them between December 6, 1920, and this date;

To McKenney & Flannery the sum of fifteen thousand dollars as compensation for services rendered by them for the year following December 6, 1920;

And to Frederic A. Delano the sum of thirty-five thousand dollars on account of his services as receiver.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Doo Fook, Petitioner,
434 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chan Wy Sheung, Petitioner,
435 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The City of Chicago,
Plaintiff in Error,
61 vs.
Chicago Railways Company, et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Leopold Sternberger et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
64 vs.

The Continental Mines, Power &
Reduction Company.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cornelius C. Watts et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
66 vs.
The State of Arizona at the
relation and to the use of
Ignatius Burgoon, Treasurer, etc.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Eastman Jones, a minor, etc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
72 vs.
H. O. Seiffert et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles S. Fairchild, Appellant,
148 vs.
Charles E. Hughes, Secretary of
State, et al.; and

Oscar Loser et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
553 vs.
J. Mercer Garnett et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf, these causes were reassigned for argument on January 3, 1922.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
20, Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

On motion of Mr. Thomas W. Gregory in that behalf, the hearing of this case on the main issue, heretofore assigned for Tuesday, January 9, 1922, was reassigned for Monday, March 6, 1922.

Julius F. Smietanka, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.,
Petitioner,
540 vs.
First Trust & Savings Bank, Trustee, etc.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. S. W. Swayze in that behalf.

Exchange Oil Company, Appellant,
120 vs.
F. C. Carter, as State Auditor, etc., et al.;

Exchange Oil Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
121 vs.
F. C. Carter, as State Auditor, etc.;

Exchange Oil Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
122 vs.
F. C. Carter, as State Auditor, etc.; and

Exchange Oil Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
123 vs.
F. C. Carter, as State Auditor, etc.

These causes were continued on motion of Mr. Levi Cooke in behalf of counsel for the appellant and plaintiff in error.

Railroad Commission of Wisconsin et al., Appellants, 206 vs. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company.

The motion for leave to file brief herein and to take part in the oral argument as amici curiae was submitted by Mr. John E. Benton in behalf of 42 States.

Barber & Company, Inc., Petitioner, 606 vs. Wilhelm Wilhelmsen et al.

The motion for leave to file brief herein as amicus curiae was submitted by Mr. R. C. Hayden for the Strong Steamship Company.

Krauss Brothers Lumber Company, Plaintiff in Error, 362 vs. Board of Assessors for the Parish of Orleans et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm herein was submitted by Mr. Harry P. Sneed and Mr. I.D.Moore for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Burt W. Henry for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

P. B. Cross, Petitioner, 603 vs. Ramdullah.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Oscar W. Lange in behalf of Mr. John S. Partridge for the petitioner, and by Mr. John W. Preston for the respondent.

Ashton F. Embry et al., Petitioners, 593 vs. The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Charles A. Douglas, Mr. Arthur Peter, Mr. Frank J. Hogan, and Mr. Hugh H. Obear for the petitioners, with leave to counsel for the respondent to file opposition within five days, if so advised.

Barber & Company, Inc., Petitioner, 606 vs. Wilhelm Wilhelmsen et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. D. Roger Englar and Mr. Dix W. Noel for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles S. Haight and Mr. John W. Griffin for the Gans Steamship Line and Mr. Charles C. Burlingham and Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper for Wilhelm Wilhelmsen et al., respondents.

Joseph B. Rose, Petitioner, 612 vs. The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. F. B. Kavanaugh and Mr. Frank P. Gentsch for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt

for the respondent.

Prudential Insurance Company of America, Plaintiff in Error,
149 vs.
Robert T. Cheek.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted by Mr. Frederick H. Bacon for the defendant in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. S. W. Fordyce, Mr. John H. Holliday, Mr. W. H. Woodward, Mr. Thomas W. White, and Mr. W. R. Mayne for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, December 5 next, at 12 o'clock.

Monday, December 5th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel T. Ansell, it is ordered that Russell Honore' Pray, Esquire, of Los Angeles, California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Andrew J. Hickey, it is ordered that William A. McVey, Esquire, of La Porte, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward T. Fenwick, it is ordered that Henry B. Floyd, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, and Eugene D. Sewall, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry W. Van Dyke, it is ordered that Ashley M. Van Duzer, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nathaniel T. Guernsey, it is ordered that William H. Duls, Esquire, of Dallas, State of

Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that Nathan Ottinger, Esquire, of New York City, and George Elias Alter, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Julian S. Jones, it is ordered that Glendy B. Arnold, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri; and J. Edward Tyler, Jr., Esquire, and Joseph Townsend England, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, it is ordered that Alexander T. Sokolow, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wayne B. Wheeler, it is ordered that Fred L. Crabbs, Esquire, of Topeka, State of Kansas; Boyd P. Doty, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts; Bernard N. Hicks, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin; G. Rowland Munroe, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey; and Orville S. Poland, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl R. Chindblom, it is ordered that Charles N. Runyan, Esquire, of Vermillion, State of South Dakota, and Fred W. Kraft, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George P. McLean, it is ordered that Marcus H. Holcomb, Esquire, of Southington, and Carlos S. Holcomb, Esquire, of Torrington, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they

were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hatton W. Sumners, it is ordered that Frank S. Anderson, Esquire, and James W. Wayman, Esquire, of Galveston, and Robert Allen Ritchie, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. W. King, it is ordered that Newton W. Gore, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. P. Freeling, it is ordered that A. T. Boys, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, and Robert L. Cole, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. Gorman, it is ordered that Edward J. Quinn, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, and Ike Lanier, Esquire, of Danville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edgar T. Brandenburg, it is ordered that S. Michael Cohen, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage, it is ordered that Charles H. Woods, Esquire, and Albert B. Enoch, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom L. Beauchamp, it is ordered that Clarence E. Gilmore, Esquire, of Austin, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Orla E. Harrison, it is ordered that Hector S. Young, Esquire, of Marion, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James W. Beller, it is ordered that George M. Porter, Esquire, of McAlester, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. H. Caraway, it is ordered that William J. Driver, Esquire, of Osceola, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Otto H. Kahn and Henri P.
Werthem Van Heukelom, as
Executors of the Last Will
and Testament of Abraham Appeal from the Court of Claims.
Wolff, deceased, Appellants,
52 vs.
The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Central Railroad Company of
New Jersey, The Pennsylvania
Railroad Company, The Baltimore Appeal from the District Court of the
and Ohio Railroad Company, et al., United States for the District of New
Appellants, Jersey.
436 vs.
The United States of America
and Interstate Commerce Commission.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the

District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

J. W. Hurley, Appellant,
33 vs.
The Commission of Fisheries of Virginia et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

(Mr. Justice Clarke concurs in the result).

James J. Rafferty, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Philippine Islands, Petitioner,
138 vs.
Smith, Bell & Company, Limited.

On Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

(Mr. Justice Clarke concurs in the result).

James J. Rafferty, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Philippine

Islands, Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of
140 vs. the Philippine Islands.
Compania General de Tabacos de
Filipinas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

(Mr. Justice Clarke concurs in the result).

James J. Rafferty, as Collector
of Internal Revenue for the On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court
Philippine Islands, Petitioner, of the Philippine Islands.
142 vs.
Visayan Refining Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

(Mr. Justice Clarke concurs in the result).

Western Fuel Company,
Petitioner, On a certificate from and writ of certiorari
28 vs. to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals
Antone Garcia, as Adminis- for the Ninth Circuit.
trator of the Estate of
Manuel Souza, deceased.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with instructions to dismiss the libel.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

North Pacific Steamship Company,
Appellant,
63 vs.
William T. Soley.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

The Robert Mitchell Furniture Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
56 vs.
Selden Breck Construction Company.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

American Steel Foundries,
Petitioner,
2 vs.
The Tri-City Central Trades Council et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed

by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed in part and affirmed in part, with costs to be paid by the respondents; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Illinois for modification of its decree in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

(Mr. Justice Brandeis concurs, in substance, in the opinion and decree of this Court).

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Clarke.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

Ex parte In the matter of George P. Ormsby, Appellant. ---, Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Julius P. Smietanka, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., Petitioner,

540 vs.

First Trust & Savings Bank, Trustee, etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, January 3d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Railroad Commission of Wisconsin et al., Appellants,

206 vs.

Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file brief and participate in the oral argument herein, as amici curiae. It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Barber & Company, Inc., Petitioner,
605 vs.
Wilhelm Wilhelmsen et al., etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file brief herein as amicus curiae,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Krauss Brothers Lumber Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
362 vs.
Board of Assessors of the Parish of Orleans et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Prudential Insurance Company of America, Plaintiff in Error,
149 vs.
Robert T. Cheek.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ashton F. Embry et al., Petitioners,
593 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

P. B. Cross, Petitioner,
603 vs.
Ramdullah.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the

United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Barber & Company, Inc., Petitioner,
606 vs.
Wilhelm Wilhelmsen et al., etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph B. Rose, Petitioner,
612 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Appellant,
256 vs.
The Western Union Telegraph Company.

The time within which to file briefs herein was extended on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner,
333 vs.
Winsted Hosiery Company.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner, this cause was reassigned for hearing on January 9, 1922.

Board of Public Utility Commissioners of the State of New Jersey, Appellant,

607 vs.

Public Service Railway Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Thomas McCran for the appellant.

Continental Insurance Company et al.,
Appellants,

609 vs.

The United States of America et al.; and

Seward Prosser et al., etc.,
Appellants,

610 vs.

The United States of America et al.

The motion to advance these causes was submitted by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage in that behalf.

Blamberg Brothers, Appellant,

512 vs.

The United States of America.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Joseph Townsend England in that behalf.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,

115 vs.

Izard County Highway Improvement District No. 1; and

Commissioners of Road Improvement District No. 2 of Lafayette County, Arkansas, Petitioner,

141 vs.

St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company.

The motion to consolidate these causes was submitted by Mr. Daniel Upthegrove in that behalf.

The State of Texas, Complainant,

24, Original. vs.

The Interstate Commerce Commission et al.

On motion of Mr. Daniel Upthegrove in behalf of St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company of Texas, leave is hereby granted to file brief herein as amicus curiae.

The State of Texas, Complainant,

24, Original. vs.

The Interstate Commerce Commission et al.

On motion of Mr. Alfred P. Thom in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to file brief herein as amicus curiae, and to participate in the oral argument of this cause.

The State Industrial Commission of the State of New York, Petitioner, vs. Nordenholt Corporation et al. 625

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. E. Clarence Aiken for the petitioner.

Joshua W. Miles, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Safe Deposit & Trust Company of Baltimore, Guardian, etc. 416

On motion of Mr. Arthur M. Marsh in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to file brief herein as amicus curiae.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas. 20, Original.

The motion of the intervener, Melish Consolidated Placer Oil Mining Association, for leave to amend its bill of intervention was submitted by Mr. Thomas P. Gore in that behalf.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas. 20, Original.

The motion of Joe Clark, Receiver of the Melish Consolidated Placer Oil Mining Association, to be joined as party complainant in the bill of intervention herein, was submitted by Mr. Thomas P. Gore in that behalf.

Theodore Bowen, Petitioner, vs. Seth Hickey. 611

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. C. C. Calhoun for the petitioner and by Mr. Ira M. Flocker for the respondent.

Louisa Pickens et al., Petitioners, vs. J. H. Merriam et al. 597

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Louisa Pickens and Johanna Schutt pro se for the petitioners, and by Mr. William J. Hunsaker, Mr. E. W. Britt, Mr. T.B. Cosgrove, and Mr. Robert B. Murphy for the respondents.

Henry E. Stevens, Jr., Petitioner, vs. Arthur S. Arnold et al. 598

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Harvey P. Carr for the petitioner.

Sherman Billingsley,
Petitioner,
613 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William F. Connolly for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Orrie Billingsley, Petitioner,
614 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William F. Connolly for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Lawrence F. Connolly, Administrator, etc., et al., Petitioners,
622 vs.
Celia Diamond et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Charles W. Beale for the petitioners.

Robert Grogan, Petitioner,
627 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William J. Fallon for the petitioner.

Township of Avon et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
560 vs.
Detroit United Railway.

The motion to dismiss or affirm herein was submitted by Mr. Elliott G. Stevenson and Mr. William L. Carpenter for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Glenn C. Gillespie for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Oklahoma Gas & Electric Company,
Appellant,
546 vs.
Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Hill, Jr., et al., Appellants,
616 vs.
Henry C. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture, etc., et al.

This cause was argued on the motion to modify the restraining order by Mr. Henry S. Robbins for the appellants and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellees.

Railroad Commission of Wisconsin et al., Appellants,
206 vs.
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company.

On motion of Mr. M. B. Olbrich in that behalf, nine hours were allowed for the reargument of this case. The reargument was commenced by Mr. M. B. Olbrich for the appellants and continued by Mr. Bruce Scott for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, December 6th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Daniel Davenport, it is ordered that George P. McLean, Esquire, of Simsbury, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James W. Carmalt, it is ordered that Henry C. Keane, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John E. Benton, it is ordered that William H. Swiggart, Jr., Esquire, of Union City, State of Tennessee, and Hugh LaMaster, Esquire, of Tecumseh, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jo. V. Morgan, it is ordered that George B. Hayes, Esquire, of New York City, and J. C. Flournoy, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. Original. No. 20.

On motion of Mr. Frederick S. Tyler in that behalf, leave was granted to file

the report of the Commissioner herein.

Railroad Commission of Wisconsin et al., Appellants, 206 vs. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Bruce Scott for the appellee, by Mr. John E. Benton for forty-five States, as amici curiae, and by Mr. Alfred P. Thom for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, December 7th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Julius Kahn, it is ordered that Max J. Kuhl, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. M. B. Olbrich, it is ordered that M. Q. Macdonald, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of thisCourt, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. Gorman, it is ordered that Harry W. Menely, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Charles Cornell, Appellant,
174 vs.
George H. Moore, Collector
of Internal Revenue;

George J. Ghio, Appellant,
175 vs.
George H. Moore, Collector
of Internal Revenue; and

William H. Bryan, Appellant,
428 vs.
Joshua W. Miles, Collector,
etc., et al.

On motion of Mrs. Mabel Walker Willebrandt in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to file brief of Wayne B. Wheeler as amicus curiae in this cause.

Railroad Commission of Wisconsin et al., Appellants,
206 vs.
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company.

The reargument of this cause was continued by Mr. Alfred P. Thom for the appellee, by Mr. Patrick J. Farrell for the Interstate Commerce Commission, and was concluded by Mr. M. B. Olbrich for the appellants.

The State of Texas, Complainant,
24, Original. vs.
The Interstate Commerce Commission et al.

On motion of Mr. Tom L. Beauchamp for the complainant, three and one-half hours were allowed for the argument of this case. The argument was commenced by Mr. Tom L. Beauchamp for the complainant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, December 8th, 1921,

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E. Alter, it is ordered that George Ross Hull, Esquire, of Harrisburg, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William N. Vaile, it is ordered that Charles J. Moynihan, Esquire, of Montrose, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard L. Merrick, it is ordered that Paul D. Wollard, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Texas, Complainant,
24, Original. vs.
The Interstate Commerce Commission
et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the Railroad Labor Board, defendant, by Mr. Patrick J. Farrell for the Interstate Commerce Commission, defendant, by Mr. Alfred P. Thom for the Association of Railway Executives as amicus curiae, by special leave of court, and was concluded by Mr. Tom L. Beauchamp for the complainant.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Complainant,

17, Original. vs.

The State of West Virginia.

Four hours were allowed for the oral argument of this case, on motion of Mr. George E. Alter for the complainant.

The argument was commenced by Mr. George E. Alter for the complainant, continued by Mr. A. Leo Weil for the complainant, and by Mr. George M. Hoffheimer for the defendant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, December 9th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred Irland, it is ordered that Frank W. Irland, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E. Alter, it is ordered that Moses R. Dickey, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
20, Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

The motion of Grand Oil and Developing Company as to jurisdiction was submitted by Mr. Robert L. Cole in that behalf.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Complainant,
17, Original. vs.
The State of West Virginia.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. George M. Hoffheimer for the defendant, and was concluded by Mr. A. Leo Weil for the complainant.

The State of Ohio, Complainant,
18, Original. vs.
The State of West Virginia.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. John G. Price for the complainant, continued by Mr. Freeman T. Eagleson for the complainant, by Mr. Fred O. Blue for the defendant, and was concluded by Mr. Philip P. Steptoe for the defendant.

Monday, December 12th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices.

Mahlon Pitney,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke,

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William W. Bride, it is ordered that Hayes McKinney, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, and W. H. Kimbrough, Esquire, of Amarillo, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas M. Baker, it is ordered that John Seybert Harbel, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney andcounsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hatton W. Sumners, it is ordered that Harry C. Hughes, Esquire, of Galveston, State of Texas; Frank Clague, Esquire, of Redwood Falls, State of Minnesota, and John W. Schmitt, Esquire, of Mankato, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that Horace M. Gray, Esquire, of Yonkers, State of New York, and Frank L. Finola, Esquire, of Pittston, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A.

Frear, it is ordered that Quincy H. Hale, Esquire, of La Crosse, and John A. Markham, Esquire, of Independence, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis W. Clements, it is ordered that C. Benton Wilson, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles L. McNary, it is ordered that James Walton, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otis B. Kent, it is ordered that John A. McManus, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. L. Jones, it is ordered that Roger Howell, Esquire, and George Moore Brady, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander P. Humphrey, it is ordered that Howard Barnes Lee, Esquire, Charles W. Milner, Esquire, and Churchill Humphrey, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. Stanley Hinrichs, it is ordered that David L. Carter, Esquire, of Ponca City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Dahnke-Walker Milling Company,

Plaintiff in Error,

30 vs.

C. T. Bondurant.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from

the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Brandeis,
Mr. Justice Clarke.

C. E. Miller, Plaintiff in Error, In Error to the United States Circuit
59 vs. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.
American Bonding Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Pennsylvania.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Rensselaer L. Curtis, Receiver of
the Atlantic National Bank of
Providence, Rhode Island, Appellant, Appeal from the United States Circuit
69 vs. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.
John J. Connly, Oscar Swanson,
Arthur W. Dennis, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the

District Court of the United States for the District of Rhode Island.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

(Mr. Justice Brandeis took no part in the decision of this case).

The Eureka Pipe Line Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
255 vs.
Walter S. Hallanan, State Tax Commissioner, and E. T. England, Attorney General, of the State of West Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Eureka Pipe Line Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
255 vs.
Walter S. Hallanan, State Tax Commissioner, and E. T. England, Attorney General, of the State of West Virginia.

In Error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court of Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Clarke,
Mr. Justice Pitney,
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

United Fuel Gas Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
276 vs.
Walter S. Hallanan, State Tax Commissioner of the State of West Virginia, and E. T. England,

Attorney General of the State
of West Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

United Fuel Gas Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
276 vs.
Walter S. Hallanan, State Tax Commissioner of the State of West Virginia, and E. T. England, Attorney General of the State of West Virginia,

In Error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court of Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Brandeis.
Mr. Justice Clarke also dissents as to the jurisdictional question.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

McLane Tilton, Appellant,
334 vs.
Felix M. Drennen, as Receiver, etc.

On consideration of the petition for a rehearing of order denying petition for writ of certiorari under Section 4 of Rule 37,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Astoria Marine Iron Works,
Plaintiff in Error,

376 vs.
United States Shipping Board Emergency
Fleet Corporation.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 6th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Blamberg Brothers, Appellant,
512 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, without prejudice to submission on printed briefs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Board of Public Utility Commissioners of the State of New Jersey, Appellant,
607 vs.
Public Service Railway Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, without prejudice.

Per Mr.Chief Justice Taft.

Continental Insurance Company et al., Appellants,
609 vs.
The United States of America et al.

Seward Prosser et al., Appellants,
610 vs.
The United States of America et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, January 16th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
115 vs.
Izard County Highway Improvement
District No. 1.

Commissioners of Road Improvement,
District No. 2, of Lafayette
County, Arkansas, Petitioners,

141 vs.
St. Louis Southwestern Railway
Company.

On consideration of the motion to consolidate these cases,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, the cases to be heard as one case when No. 11b is reached.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, 20, Original. vs. The State of Texas.

On consideration of the motion of Mellish Consolidated Placer Oil Mining Association for leave to amend its bill of intervention in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, 20, Original. vs. The State of Texas.

On consideration of the motion of Clark, Receiver, to be joined as a party complainant in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, 20, Original. vs. The State of Texas, Defendant; The United States of America, Intervener.

The motion of the Grand Oil & Developing Company, submitted December 9, 1921, is granted to the extent that said company is hereby given leave to file a petition in intervention setting up its rights and claims in and to any portion of the territory in dispute by reason of the controversy as to the location of the boundary line between the States of Oklahoma and Texas; without waiver of the right of said company to object to the jurisdiction of this Court over the subject matter.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
20, Original. vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant;
The United States of America, Intervenor.

Order on Claims of J. R. Armstrong, et al.

Upon consideration of the report of Frederick S. Tyler, Special Master, respecting the claims of J. R. Armstrong, et al., on a certain fund in the hands of the receiver, and derived by him from Receiver's Wells numbered 157, 162 and 170, and it appearing that copies of said report have been mailed to counsel for the respective claimants and that no exceptions or objections thereto have been presented;

It is ordered that said report be, and it is hereby, approved, and that the receiver be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay over said fund to the following persons and in the following amounts, to wit:

Wayland H. Sandford, Assignee of W. H. Young,	$5,546.56
Painter & Ziegler Tank Company,	2,051.73
Ray Compton,	222.00
McGee Brothers,	3,763.51
W. A. McGrew,	120.00
R. A. Worrell,	155.52
Universal Supply Company,	125.00
Gilmore Lumber Company,	1,776.00
Western Oil Corporation,	3,247.21
Maunders Trucking Company,	1,157.50
C. J. Wall,	333.20
J. J. Stultz,	400.00
A. M. Nash,	182.87
T. P. Roberts,	13,333.33
A. H. Brittain,	6,667.67
Husted & Tucker,	2,856.35
Pope & Company,	60.00
James R. Armstrong, the balance of said fund amounting approximately to,	6,859.31

with interest upon each of said amounts at the rate of three per centum per annum from December 1st, 1920; Provided, however, that there shall first be deducted from said fund and paid to Frederick S. Tyler the sum of one thousand and forty-eight dollars and thirty-eight cents to cover in full his services and expenses as such master in connection with said fund and the claims to it; and the amount so paid to him shall be deducted pro rata from the several awards hereby made to the claimants above named.

And it is further ordered that the payment and acceptance of said

several awards as herein made shall operate and be taken as a release and discharge of the Receiver by such claimants of all claims on and to the fund so disbursed and distributed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Township of Avon et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
560 vs.
Detroit United Railway.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and on motion to dismiss or affirm, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry E. Stevens, Jr.,
Petitioner,
598 vs.
Arthur S. Arnold et al.,
Executors, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State Industrial Commission of the State of New York,
Petitioner,
625 vs.
Nordenholt Corporation et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louisa Pickens et al., Petitioners, On petition for writ of certiorari to
597 vs. the United States Circuit Court of
J. H. Merriam et al. Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Theodore Bowen, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to
611 vs. the District Court of Appeal, Second
Seth Hickey. District of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the District Court of Appeal, Second District of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sherman Billingsley, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to
613 vs. the United States Circuit Court of
The United States of America. Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Orrie Billingsley, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to
614 vs. the United States Circuit Court of
The United States of America. Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lawrence F. Connolly, Administrator,
etc., et al., Petitioners,

622 vs. Celia Diamond et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert Grogan, Petitioner,
627 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Hill, Jr., et al.,
Appellants,
616 vs.
Henry C. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture, etc., et al.

Order.

The order entered herein, November 21, 1921, so far as it operates to stay proceedings pending the appeal is hereby vacated, and in lieu thereof it is ordered (the appellees not objecting), that during the pendency of said appeal in this court and for 20 days after final decree herein the Board of Trade of the City of Chicago and its directors, appellees, are restrained from admitting to membership in said board any representative of a cooperative association of producers not otherwise admissible to membership under the rules of said Board of Trade in effect prior to the institution of this suit, and from making and filing or requiring appellants or any other of its members to make and file any report required by any rule or regulation issued by the Secretary of Agriculture under the Act of Congress approved August 24, 1921, entitled "the Future Trading Act," and from modifying its rules and by-laws in respect to admitting to membership any representative of any such cooperative association or in respect to the making and filing of such reports, in order

to entitle said Board of Trade to be designated as a "contract market;"

And that during the same period the appellee, Henry C. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture, is restrained from designating the said Chicago Board of Trade as a "contract market" except temporarily for and during said period, and is restrained from requiring said Board of Trade during said period to comply with the conditions and requirements of section 5 of said Act as to the making and filing of reports showing the details and terms of transactions entered into by the board or the members thereof, or as to the keeping by the board or its members of a record showing the details and terms of said transactions; and from requiring the governing board of said Chicago Board of Trade during said period to admit to membership and the privileges thereof any representative of a cooperative association of producers not otherwise admissible to membership under the rules of said Board of Trade in effect prior to the institution of this suit;

And that the said Henry C. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture, is authorized to designate the said Board of Trade of the City of Chicago as a "contract market" under the said Act of Congress, for and during the same period, without requiring said Board of Trade to comply with the conditions and requirements of section 5 of said Act in the several respects above mentioned;

This order is made upon condition that within 5 days hereafter the appellants execute unto the appellees herein and file in this cause a good and sufficient bond in the sum of twenty-five thousand dollars($25,000), with sureties to be approved by the clerk of this court, and conditioned that the appellants will promptly pay any and all damages which may be suffered by the appellees herein, or any of them, by reason of the granting or continuance of this order, if it is ultimately adjudged that the said "Future Trading Act" is a valid Act in whole or in part.

The Chief Justice also announced that the Court will take a recess from Monday, December 19, to Tuesday, January 3, next.

The United States of America ex rel. Robert A. Widenmann, Plaintiff in Error,
92 vs.
Charles E. Hughes, as Secretary of State, etc.

The motion to dismiss or affirm herein was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. George W. Tucker and Mr. Everett V. Abbot for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

The United States of America ex rel. Harry S.Mecartney, Plaintiff in Error, 155 vs. Bainbridge Colby, Secretary of State, et al.	The motion to dismiss or affirm herein was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. W. C. Sullivan and Mr. Harry S. Mecartney for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.
The United States of America, Petitioner, 313 vs. Wesley L. Sischo.	The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner.
The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, 480 vs. Frank Balint.et al.	The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the plaintiff in error.
The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, 582 vs. Morris Behrman.	The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the plaintiff in error.
Ernest Lipke, Appellant, 596 vs. Ephraim Lederer, Collector, etc.	The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee.
The United States of America, Petitioner, 629 vs. Charles Walter Moreland.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner.
The Valley Farms Company of Yonkers, Plaintiff in Error, 448 vs. County of Westchester.	The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. W. W. Bride in that behalf.
Joshua W. Miles, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., Plaintiff in Error, 415 vs.	

The Safe Deposit and Trust Company of Baltimore, Guardian, etc.

The motion for leave to file brief herein, as amicus curiae, was submitted by Mr. Mansfield Ferry for the Farmers Loan & Trust Company, trustee under trusts created by Archibald D. Russell, deceased.

James R. Ward, Plaintiff in Error,
18 vs.
The People of the State of Illinois ex rel. Chicago Bar Association.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex Parte In the matter of the United States, owner of the American Steamship "Western Maid," Petitioner;
21, Original.

Ex Parte In the matter of the United States, former requisitioned or chartered owner of the auxiliary schooner "Liberty", Petitioner;
22, Original.

and

Ex Parte In the matter of the United States, former requisitioned and chartered owner of the American Steamship "Carolinian", etc., Petitioners.
23, Original.

The argument herein was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioners, continued by Mr. T. Catesby Jones for the respondent in No. 21, Original, by Mr. E. K. Blodgett for the respondent in No. 22, Original, and by Mr. Charles S. Haight for the respondent in No. 23, Original.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, December 13th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merrill Moores, it is ordered that William Durvin Fitzpatrick, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George F. Wells, it is ordered that John Tilney Carpenter, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletcher, it is ordered that O. O. McCollum, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Ex Parte In the Matter of The United States, owner of the American Steamship "Western Maid", Petitioner;
21, Original.

and

Ex Parte In the Matter of The United States, former requisitioned or chartered owner of

the auxiliary schooner "Liberty",

Petitioner;

22, Original.

and

Ex Parte In the Matter of The United States, former requisitioned and chartered owner of the American Steamship "Carolinian", etc., Petitioner.

23, Original.

The argument herein was continued by Mr. Charles S. Haight for the respondent in No. 23, Original, and was concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioners.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,

20, Original. vs.

The State of Texas.

On motion of Mr. Frank Dale in that behalf, five and one-quarter hours were allowed for the argument in this case.

The argument was commenced by Mr. Frank Dale for the Bark Divide Oil Company, Consolidated, et al., continued by Mr. T. P. Gore for Molish Consolidated Placer Oil Mining Association et al., by Mr. Jesse B. Rooto for Bark Divide Oil Company, Consolidated, et al., by Mr. Henry E. Asp for E. Everett Rowell, et al., by Mr. W. A. Ledbetter for A. E. Pearson et al., by Mr. George P. Rowell for E. Everett Rowell et al., by Mr. L. C. Boggs for E. Everett Rowell et al., and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. W. W. Dyer for the United States.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, December 14th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. M. O. Macdonald, it is ordered that John L. Mecham, Esquire, of Battle Creek, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, 20, Original. vs. The State of Texas.

On motion of Mr. T. L. Gore for the Burk-Burnett Placer Mining & Oil Company, leave is hereby granted to file brief herein, with leave to Mr. Jesse B. Roote to file reply of Burk Divide Oil Company, Consolidated, et al., within three days thereafter.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, 20, Original. vs. The State of Texas.

The argument herein was continued by Mr. W. W. Dyar for The United States, by Mr. George Trice for D. D. Brunson, et al., and was concluded by Mr. S. P. Freeling for The State of Oklahoma.

Ward and Gow, Plaintiff in Error, 343 vs. Himan Krinskry et al.

The argument herein was commenced by Mr. Herman S. Hertwig for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. E. Clarence Aiken for the defendant in error The State Industrial Commission, and was concluded by Mr. Herman S. Hertwig for the plaintiff in error.

The Territory of Alaska et al.,
Appellants,
392 vs.
John W. Troy, Collector, etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. John Rustgard for the appellants, and continued by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, December 15th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter M. Chandler, it is ordered that Walter E. Ernst, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl H. Chindblom, it is ordered that William H. Beckman, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Territory of Alaska et al.,
Appellants,
392 vs.
John W. Troy, Collector, etc.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. John Rustgard for the appellants.

Charles Corneli, Appellant,
174 vs.
George H. Moore, Collector of
Internal Revenue;

George J. Ghio, Appellant,
175 vs.
George H. Moore, Collector of
Internal Revenue;

William H. Bryan, Appellant,
428 vs.
Joshua W. Miles, Collector,
etc., et al.; and

Walter A. Eastes, Appellant,
548 vs.
George B. Crutchley, Collector,
etc., et al.

The argument herein was commenced by Mr. Elliott W. Major for the appellants in Nos. 174, 175, and 548, continued by Mr. J. S. Jones for the appellant in No. 428, by Mr. Glendy B. Arnold for the appellants in Nos. 174, 175, and 548, by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the appellees, and was concluded by Mr. J. W. Bryan for the appellant in No. 428.

Galveston Electric Company,
Appellant,
455 vs.
City of Galveston et al.

The argument herein was commenced by Mr. William E. Tucker for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, December 16th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander P. Humphrey, it is ordered that Robert A. Taft, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roy G. Fitzgerald, it is ordered that Chalmers M. Parker, Esquire, of Columbus, and Israel M. Foster, Esquire, of Athens, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur W. Machen, Jr., it is ordered that Raymond S. Williams, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Minna Lombard Crichton, Appellant,
312 vs.
Magrie L. Wingfield.

On motion of Mr. Kenneth D. McKellar, in behalf of Mr. John W. Cutrer and Mr. Thomas B. Felder for the appellant, and by Mr. Louis Marshall and Mr. James Marshall for the appellee, this cause was advanced and submitted, pursuant to the thirty-second rule.

Galveston Electric Company,
Appellant,

455 vs.
City of Galveston et al.

The argument herein was continued by Mr. William E. Tucker for the appellant, by Mr. Frank S. Anderson for the appellees, and was concluded by Mr. James W. Wayman for the appellees.

The City of Louisville
592 vs.
Louisville Railway Company.
Louisville Railway Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. J. S. Lawton for the City of Louisville, and by Mr. Churchill Humphrey for Louisville Railway Company.

Joshua W. Miles, Collector, etc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
416 vs.
The Safe Deposit & Trust Company
of Baltimore, Guardian, etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. William C. Herron for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Arthur W. Machen, Jr., for the defendant in error.

James C. Davis, Director General,
etc., et al., Appellants,
329 vs.
George Wallace et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. C. W. Bunn for the appellants, and by Mr. George E. Wallace for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, December 19th, 1921.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stanton J. Peelle, it is ordered that Charles E. Cox, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, and Marion C. Spicer, Esquire, of Socorro, State of New Mexico, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard H. Liggett, it is ordered that LeRoy B. Giles, Esquire, of Orlando, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sidney R. Prince, it is ordered that Richard C. Beckett, Esquire, of West Point, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Vernon E. West, it is ordered that William K. Quinter, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Paul D. Doherty, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the court in this behalf by Mr. Burton L. French, it is ordered that Grundy Orr McMinimy, Esquire, of Craigmont, State

of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

William Truax and William A.Truax, Copartners, doing business under the firm name and style of William Truax, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Michael Corrigan, Albert Shipp, Charles Brooks, et al. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona.

13

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes,
Mr. Justice Pitney,
Mr. Justice Clarke,
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

American Column & Lumber Company et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Tennessee.

71

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Tennessee, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes,
Mr. Justice Brandeis,
Mr. Justice McKenna.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the court:

The United States of America
ex rel. Robert A. Widenmann,
Plaintiff in Error,
92 vs.
Charles E. Hughes, as Secretary
of State of the United States.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America
ex relatione Harry S. Mecartney,
Plaintiff in Error,
155 vs.
Bainbridge Colby, Secretary of
State, and Henry J. Bryan, Editor
of Laws.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
313 vs.
Wesley L. Sischo.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 6th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Valley Farms Company of Yonkers,
Plaintiff in Error,
448 vs.
County of Westchester.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, without prejudice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
480 vs.
Frank Balint et al.
and
The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
582 vs.
Morris Behrman.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases,
It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, March 6th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ernest Lipke, Appellant,
596 vs.
Ephraim Lederer, Collector, etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 6th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joshua W. Miles, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
416 vs.
The Safe Deposit & Trust Company of Baltimore, Guardian, etc.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file brief of Mansfield Ferry herein as amicus curiae,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

McLane Tilton, Appellant,
334 vs.
Felix M. Drennen, as Receiver, etc.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,

629 vs. On petition for writ of certiorari to the
Charles Walter Moreland. Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

City of Louisville On a certificate from the United States
vs. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.
Louisville Railway Company.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that this certificate must be dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Appellant,
67 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.
Henry W. Volk, as Trustee, etc.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal and remand the cause for further proceedings has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Appellant,
68 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.
Emil Schoyen, as Administrator,
etc., et al.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal and remand the cause for further proceedings, has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the

said Court of Claims for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner, vs. Sinclair Refining Company. 630 — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. W. H. Fuller, Mr. Adrien F. Busick, and Mr. Eugene W. Burr for the petitioner.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas. 20, Original. — On motion of Mr. Frederick S. Tyler in that behalf, the supplemental report of the commissioner herein was filed.

Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland, Appellant, vs. The United States. 207 — The motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims for further findings was submitted by Mr. Simon Lyon for the appellant.

Sam Cohen, Petitioner, vs. The United States. 650 — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Vernon E. West in behalf of Mr. Chester H. Krum for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Alexander Howat et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The State of Kansas. 154 — The motion to dismiss or to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Spencer Gordon in behalf of Mr. Richard J. Hopkins and Mr. Fred S. Jackson for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Redmond S. Brennan and Mr. John F. McCarron for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Alexander Howat et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The State of Kansas. 491 — The motion to advance and consolidate herein was submitted by Mr. Spencer Gordon in behalf of Mr. Richard J. Hopkins, Mr. Moorfield Storey, and Mr. Baxter D. McClain for the defendant in error.

Henry F. Maresca et al., Petitioners, vs. 632 — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John W. Davis for the petitioners, and by Mr.

Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, as Agent, etc., Petitioner,

652 vs.

L. N. Dantzler Lumber Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Carl Fox and Mr. R. C. Beckett for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Tuesday, January 3 next, at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, January 3, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that Arthur H. Taylor, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. H. Carraway, it is ordered that Robert E. Brown, Esquire, of Fort Valley, Isma Lee Price, Esquire, of Swainsboro, and W. W. Larsen, Esquire, of Dublin, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John L. Caldwell, it is ordered that Samuel James McWilliams, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Wood, it is ordered that Horace Conwell Stilwell, Esquire, of Anderson, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Milton Strasburger, it is ordered that Arthur Ofner, Esquire, and Harry H. Wessel,

Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tilman B. Parks, it is ordered that Robert L. Searcy, Jr., Esquire, of Louisville, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice in this court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin H. Abbot, Jr., it is ordered that Jay R. Benton, Esquire, of Belmont, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Mabel Walker Willebrandt, it is ordered that Leonard C. Husar, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James P. Gilmore, it is ordered that Thomas F. X. Callahan, Esquire, Effie Winram Callahan and Edmond C. Fletcher, Esquire, of Kansas City, Missouri, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John K. Parish, it is ordered that Frank E. Tyler, Esquire, of Hattiesburg, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Edward R. Cunningham, Plaintiff in Error,
42 vs.
James Linn Rodgers, Andrew Denny Rodgers, and Frank R. Shinn.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Grant Smith-Porter Ship Company
35 vs.
Herman F. Rohde.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause come on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court:

(A) That, construing the first question as meaning to inquire whether the general admiralty jurisdiction extends to a proceeding to recover damages resulting from a tort committed on a vessel in process of construction when lying on navigable waters within a State, we answer, yes;

(B) That, assuming that the second question presents the inquiry whether in the circumstances stated the exclusive features of the Oregon Workmen's Compensation Act would apply and abrogate the right to recover damages in an admiralty court which otherwise would exist, we also answer, yes.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Southern Pacific Railroad Company,
Appellant,
60 vs.
Albert B. Fall, Secretary of the Interior,
and William Spry, Commissioner of the
General Land Office.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner,
47 vs.
Beech-Nut Packing Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Holmes,
Mr. Justice McKenna,
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Mr. Justice McReynolds also dissents.

Ex parte In the matter of the United States, Owner of the American Steamship "Western Maid", Petitioner.
21, Original.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of prohibition and/or a writ of mandamus herein, of the return to the rule to show cause, and the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the rule to show cause be made absolute and that the writ of prohibition as prayed be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice McKenna,
Mr. Justice Day,
Mr. Justice Clarke.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

Ex parte In the matter of the United States, former requisitioned or chartered owner of the Auxiliary Schooner "Liberty", Petitioner.
22, Original.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of prohibition and/or a writ of mandamus herein, of the return to the rule to show cause, and the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the rule to show cause be made absolute and that the writ of prohibition as prayed be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice McKenna,
Mr. Justice Day,
Mr. Justice Clarke.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

Ex parte In the matter of The United States, former requisitioned and chartered owner of the American Steamship "Carolinian", etc., Petitioner.

23, Original.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of prohibition and/or a writ of mandamus herein, of the return to the rule to show cause, and the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the rule to show cause be made absolute and that the writ of prohibition as prayed be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice McKenna,
Mr. Justice Day,
Mr. Justice Clarke.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland, Appellant,

207 vs.

The United States.

On consideration of the motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims for further findings,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, without prejudice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United Mine Workers of America et al., Petitioners,

29 vs.

Coronado Coal Company et al.

United Mine Workers of America et al., Plaintiffs in Error,

31 vs.

Coronado Coal Company et al.

Alexander Howat et al., Plaintiffs in Error,

It is ordered by this Court that these cases be restored to the docket for reargument and assigned for hearing on Monday, February 27th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

154 vs.
The State of Kansas.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alexander Howat et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
154 vs.
The State of Kansas.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 27th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alexander Howat et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
491 vs.
The State of Kansas.

On consideration of the motion to advance and consolidate this cause with case No. 154, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument with case No. 154.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner,
630 vs.
Sinclair Refining Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Director General, etc., Petitioner,
652 vs.
L. N. Dantzler Lumber Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry F. Maresca et al.,
Petitioners,
632 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sam Cohen, Petitioner,
650 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank H. Schurmann, Appellant,
144 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee in support of the motion.

J. W. Bailey et al., etc.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
657 vs.
Drexel Furniture Company;
and
J. W. Bailey, Collector, etc.,
et al., Appellants,
590 vs.
John J. George, etc.

The motion to advance these causes for hearing on March 6th next was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf.

Charles Ponzi
631 vs.

Franklin G. Pessenden et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. E. H. Abbot, Jr., in that behalf.

John Doe, demise of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts,
Plaintiff,
---, Original. vs.
The City of Rochester, a municipal corporation of the State of New York,
Defendant.

The motion for leave to file a declaration in ejectment herein was submitted by Mr. E. H. Abbot, Jr., in behalf of Mr. J. Weston Allen for the plaintiff.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts,
Plaintiff,
---, Original. vs.
Eugene Van Voorhis et al.,
Commissioners of Appraisal,
Defendants.

The motion for leave to file a declaration in a suit at law for a writ of prohibition was submitted by Mr. E. H. Abbot, Jr., in behalf of Mr. J. Weston Allen for the plaintiff.

Concrete Steel Company,
Petitioner,
674 vs.
George E. Vandenburg.

The motion for stay of execution was submitted by Mr. Thomas J. Johnston for the petitioner.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
333 vs.
Winsted Hosiery Company.

The motion for leave to file brief herein as amici curiae was submitted by Mr. Daniel Davenport in behalf of Silk Association of America and others.

International Railway Company,
Appellant,
340 vs.
George G. Davidson, Individually and as Collector, etc., et al.;
and
Thomas Snyder, on behalf of himself, etc., Appellant,
368 vs.
George G. Davidson, Jr., Individually,

On motion of Mr. Basil Robillard in behalf of Mr. John W. Beaumont, leave is hereby granted to file brief herein as amicus curiae.

Toledo Scale Company, Petitioner, 669 vs. The Computing Scale Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Frederick P. Fish, Mr. Edward Rector, and Mr. Robert H. Parkinson for the petitioner, and by Mr. John M. Zane and Mr. Charles F. Morse for the respondent.
Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants, 671 vs. The Brooklyn Union Gas Company.	The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Harry Hertzoff in that behalf.
The State Industrial Commission of the State of New York, Petitioner, 625 vs. Nordenholt Corporation et al.	The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Harry Hertzoff in that behalf.
The United States of America, Petitioner, 629 vs. Charles Walter Moreland.	The joint motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. George P. Barse in that behalf.
Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner, 333 vs. Winsted Hosiery Company.	The motion for leave to file brief herein as amici curiae was submitted by Mr. Nelson J. Jouett in behalf of Mr. Frank S. Reed and Mr. Edward S. Rogers.
Bulk Oil Transports, Petitioner, 670 vs. T. Langland Thompson.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William J. Mr. Saul S. Myers and Mr. Charles H. Tuttle Hughes, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper for the respondent.
Salmon River Canal Company, Limited, Plaintiff in Error, 527 vs. Thomas Sanderson.	The motion to dismiss herein was submitted by Mr. E. M. Wolfe for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. James H. Richards and Mr. Oliver O. Haga for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.
Everglades Sugar & Land Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error, 247 vs. Frank A. Bryan, Clerk, etc., et al.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Everglades Sugar & Land Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error, 294 vs. Frank A. Bryan, Clerk, etc., et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiffs in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Wyoming, Complainant, 3, Original. vs. The State of Colorado et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf, this cause is hereby reassigned for argument on Monday, January 9, at the foot of the call.

Adelbert A. Weiland, as State Engineer, etc., et al., Appellants, 3 vs. The Pioneer Irrigation Company.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf, this cause is hereby reassigned for argument on Monday, January 9, at the foot of the call.

The Standard Fashion Company, Petitioner, 20 vs. Magrane-Houston Company; and United Shoe Machinery Corporation et al., Appellants, 119 vs. The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf, these cases are hereby reassigned for argument at the foot of the call for Friday, January 13.

John Hill, Jr., et al., Appellants,
616 vs.
Henry C. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture, etc., et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf, this cause is hereby reassigned for argument at the foot of the call for January 9.

F. A. Gillespie, Plaintiff in Error,
322 vs.
The State of Oklahoma.

This cause was argued by Mr. James P. Gilmore for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. C. W. King for the defendant in error.

International Railway Company,
Appellant,
340 vs.
George G. Davidson, Individually and as Collector, etc., et al.;
and
Thomas Snyder, on behalf of himself, etc., Appellant,
368 vs.
George G. Davidson, Jr., Individually, etc., et al.

The argument herein was commenced by Mr. Basil Robillard for the appellants, and continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Ottinger for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, January 4th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

International Railway Company,
Appellant,
340 vs.
George G. Davidson, Individually and as Collector, etc., et al.;
and
Thomas Snyder, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, Appellant,
368 vs.
George G. Davidson, Jr., Individually, etc., et al.

The argument herein was continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Ottinger for the appellees and concluded by Mr. Basil Robillard for the appellants.

Western Union Telegraph Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
259 vs.
Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company.

The argument herein was commenced by Mr. Alexander Pope Humphrey for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. Helm Bruce for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Rush Taggart for the plaintiff in error.

The State of Georgia, Complainant,
16, Original. vs.
The State of South Carolina.

The argument herein was commenced by Mr. Thomas F. Green for the complainant, and continued by Mr. Samuel A. Wolfe for the defendant.

Thursday, January 5th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Atlee Pomerene, it is ordered that George Wallace Alvord, Esquire, of Painesville, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Julius F. Smietanka, as Collector, etc., Petitioner, 540 vs. First Trust & Savings Bank, Trustee, etc.

On motion of Mr. S. W. Swayne in that behalf, this cause is hereby reassigned for argument at the foot of the call for January 16.

The State of Georgia, Complainant, 16, Original. vs. The State of South Carolina.

The argument herein was continued by Mr. Samuel M. Wolfe for the defendant, by Mr. A. M. Lumpkin for the defendant, and concluded by Mr. George M. Napier for the complainant.

The State of North Dakota, ex rel. William Lemke, Attorney General, Complainant, 25, Original. vs. Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company et al.

On motion of Mr. Blackburn Esterline in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to file brief of the United States as amicus curiae.

On motion of Mr. Karl Knox Gartner in that behalf, leave is granted to file additional brief for the complainant within ten days.

This cause was argued, on the motion to dismiss, by Mr. C. W. Bunn for the

defendants in support of the motion, and by Mr. Karl Knox Gartner for the complainant in opposition thereto.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants,

295 vs.

The Kings County Lighting Company.

The motion for leave to file brief of Harry E. Lewis, as District Attorney of the County of Kings, was denied.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Wilbur W. Chambers for the appellants and continued by Mr. Samuel F. Moran for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, January 6th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis Van Devanter,

Mahlon Pitney,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke,

Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur Hellen, it is ordered that Thomas W. Bowers, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. C. Dowell, it is ordered that John B. Sullivan, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard N. Elliott, it is ordered that John M. Sayler, Esquire, of Huntington, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Everett Sanders, it is ordered that Macy E. Watkins, Esquire, of Roachdale, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants, 295 vs. The Kings County Lighting Company.

The argument herein was continued by Mr. S. F. Moran for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Wilbur W. Chambers for the appellants.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants, 296 vs. New York & Queens Gas Company.	The argument herein was commenced by Mr. M. Maldwin Fertig for appellant Wallace, continued by Mr. William L. Ransom for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Wilbur W. Chambers for the appellants.
The Morrisdale Coal Company, Appellant, 65 vs. The United States.	The argument herein was commenced by Mr. Gibbs L. Baker for the appellant, and continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Riter for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, January 9th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that Thomas P. Cadwalader, Esquire, of Joppa, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Marbury, it is ordered that George Arnold Frick, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sylvester L. McLaurin, it is ordered that Wister J. Owens, Esquire, of Muskogee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter W. Barns, it is ordered that John F. Heins, Esquire, of Elizabeth, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins, it is ordered that Manwell Steinhardt, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John P. Gray, it is ordered that Lyman K. Aughenbaugh, Esquire, of Waynesboro, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads; Northern Pacific Railway Company, et al., Appellants,
329 vs.
George Wallace et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of North Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of North Dakota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

The United States of America, Appellant,
5 vs.
Southern Pacific Company et al.

It is ordered by this Court that this cause be restored to the docket for reargument and set for hearing on Monday, March 13th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. W. Bailey et al., etc.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
657 vs.
Drexel Furniture Company;
and
J. W. Bailey, Collector of Internal Revenue, et al., Appellants,
590 vs.
John J. George, trading and doing business as Vivian Cotton Mills, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases,
It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, March 6th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Ponzi
631 vs.
Franklin C. Fessenden et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 6th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of New York, et al.,
Appellants,
671 vs.
The Brooklyn Union Gas Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 6th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State Industrial Commission of the State of New York,
Petitioner,
625 vs.
Nordenholt Corporation.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 6th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
629 vs.
Charles Walter Moreland.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 6th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank H. Schumann, Appellant,
144 vs.
The United States of America.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until proper notice under paragraph 4, rule 6, fixing the time for submission, and proof of service thereof, shall be given.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Salmon River Canal Company, Limited, Plaintiff in Error,
527 vs.
Thomas Sanderson.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Doe, Demise of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Plaintiff,
---, Original. vs.
The City of Rochester, New York.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a declaration in ejectment herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that cause be shown by the City of Rochester, a Municipal Corporation of the State of New York, before this Court, at the City of Washington, on Monday, February 27th, 1922, or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, why the motion for leave to file a declaration in ejectment herein should not be granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Plaintiff,
---, Original. vs.
Eugene Van Voorhis et al., Commissioners of Appraisal, etc.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a declaration in a suit at law for a writ of prohibition herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that cause be shown by Eugene Van Voorhis, John A. Vanderwerf and Charles C. Beahan, as Commissioners of Appraisal in the matter entitled "State of New York, Supreme Court, Monroe County, In the matter of the Application of The City of Rochester to acquire certain lands for park and other municipal purposes in the Twenty-third Ward in said City", before this Court at the City of Washington, on Monday, February 27th, 1922, why the motion for leave to file a declaration in a suit at law for a writ of prohibition herein should not be granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner,
333 vs.
Winsted Hosiery Company.

On consideration of the motion of Daniel Davenport for leave to file brief on behalf of Silk Association of America et al. as amici curiae in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner, vs. Winsted Hosiery Company. — On consideration of the motion of Mr. Nelson J. Jouett on behalf of Messrs. Reed and Rogers for leave to file brief of the Armstrong Cork Company et al. as amici curiae in this cause,

333

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Toledo Scale Company, Petitioner, vs. The Computing Scale Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

669

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Bulk Oil Transports, Petitioner, vs. T. Langland Thompson. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

670

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Complainant, vs. The State of West Virginia. — It is ordered by this Court that this cause be restored to the docket for re-argument on February 27th, with special reference to the questions:

17, Original.

(1) Whether the suit was not prematurely brought as no action has been taken either by the State or by the State Commission under the statute; and

(2) Whether the bill presents a cause justiciable between the two States parties to the action.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Ohio, Complainant,

The State of West Virginia.

It is ordered by this Court that this cause be restored to the docket for reargument on February 27th, with special reference to the questions:

(1) Whether the suit was not prematurely brought as no action has been taken either by the State or by the State Commission under the statute; and

(2) Whether the bill presents a cause justiciable between the two States parties to the action.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas Snyder, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, Appellant,
368 vs.
George G. Davidson, Jr., Individually and as Collector of Customs of the Ninth Customs District, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sloan Shipyards Corporation et al., Appellants,
308 vs.
United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellees.

The United States, Appellant,
67 vs.
Henry W. Volk, as Trustee, etc.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellant, the mandate in this cause is hereby granted.

The United States, Appellant,
68 vs.
Emil Schoyen, as Administrator, etc., et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellant, the mandate in this cause is hereby granted.

Jacques Rousso, Petitioner,
654 vs.
Reuben E. Barber et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Joshua R. H. Potts for the petitioner.

The K. W. Ignition Company, Petitioner,
643 vs.
Ford Motor Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Maxwell Steinhardt in behalf of Mr. Emory R. Buckner for the petitioner, and by Mr. Otto F. Barthel, Mr. Edward Rector, and Mr. W. Clyde Jones for the respondent.

The State of North Dakota ex rel. William Lemke, Attorney General, Complainant,
25, Original. vs.
Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company et al.

On motion of Mr. Blackburn Esterline in behalf of Mr. Charles W. Bunn for the defendants, leave is hereby granted to file suggestions in answer to brief of complainant.

Crown Dye and Tool Company, Petitioner,
576 vs.
Nye Tool and Machine Works.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Florence King for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. H. Dyrenforth and Mr. George A. Chritton for the respondent.

Dora E. Rooker et al., Petitioners,
634 vs.
Fidelity Trust Company et al.

The time within which to submit petition for a writ of certiorari herein was extended on motion of Mr. William V. Rooker for the petitioners.

H. S. Herrick, Petitioner,
628 vs.
A. Basletta.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. H. S. Herrick, pro se.

Wabash Railway Company, Petitioner,
648 vs.
Miles Elliott.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney and Mr. M. S. Brown for the petitioner, and by Mr. William Buchholz, Mr. I. B. Kimbrell, and Mr. Martin J. O'Donnell for the respondent.

Walter Matthey, Petitioner,
656 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. A. G. Bush for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, etc., Petitioner,
661 vs.
E. C. Akins.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Joseph M. Bryson for the petitioners and by Mr. Charles Stephens for the respondent.

Walker D. Hines, Director General of Railroads, et al., Petitioners,
662 vs.
John H. Butler et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. George Neems Williams for the petitioners, and by Mr. John H. Skeen, Mr. George Forbes, and Mr. J. Purdon Wright for the respondents.

William J. Jackson, as Receiver of Chicago & Eastern Illinois Railroad Company, Petitioner,
680 vs.
Perry D. White.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Edward W. Rawlins and Mr. H. T. Dick for the petitioner.

Charles S. Fairchild, Appellant,
148 vs.
Charles E. Hughes, Secretary of State, et al.; and
Oscar Leser et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
553 vs.
J. Mercer Garnett et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf, these cases were reassigned for January 20, at the foot of the call.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner,
333 vs.
Winsted Hosiery Company.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf, this case was reassigned for March 13 next.

The Morrisdale Coal Company, Appellant,
65 vs.
The United States.

The argument herein was continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Hiter for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Gibbs L. Baker for the appellant.

The State of Wyoming, Complainant,
3, Original. vs.
The State of Colorado et al.

On motion of Mr. John W. Lacey in that behalf, six hours and twenty minutes were allowed for reargument in this case. The reargument was commenced by

Mr. H. E. Corthell for the complainant, continued by Mr. Victor E. Keyes and by Mr. Delph E. Carpenter for the defendants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, January 10th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Ballard Moore, it is ordered that William W. Ammen, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, it is ordered that R. M. Fitzgerald, Esquire, of Oakland, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Wyoming, Complainant,
3,Orig'l. vs.
The State of Colorado et al.

The reargument herein was continued by Mr. Delph E. Carpenter for the defendants, by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Riter for the United States, by Mr. Platt Rogers for the defendants, and concluded by Mr. John W. Lacey for the complainant.

Adelbert A. Weiland, as State Engineer, etc., et al.,
Appellants,
3 vs.
The Pioneer Irrigation Company.

The reargument herein was commenced by Mr. Victor E. Keyes for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, January 11th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that John J. McDevitt, Jr., Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl R. Chindblom, it is ordered that Robert A. Milroy, Esquire, of Aurora, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Alfred P. Smith et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States. — In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon.

86

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, of counsel for the defendant in error, and it appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause and remand this cause for further proceedings in accordance therewith, has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph R. Bowles et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States. — In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon.

87

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, of counsel for the defendant in error, and it appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause and remand this cause for further proceedings, in accordance therewith, has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Adelbert A. Weiland, as State Engineer, etc., et al., Appellants, vs. The Pioneer Irrigation Company. — The argument herein was continued by Mr. Edwin H. Park for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Dolph E. Carpenter for the appellant.

3

John Hill, Jr., et al., Appellants, vs. Henry C. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture, et al. — The argument herein was commenced by Mr. Henry S. Robbins for the appellants, and continued by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellees.

616

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edgar C. Ellis, it is ordered that Charles M. Miller, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

John W.Davidge,
Plaintiff in Error,
79 vs.
Leo Simmons.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Chapin Brown, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John W. Davidge,
Petitioner,
58 vs.
Leo Simmons.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Chapin Brown, of counsel for the petitioner, and he having moved the Court

to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein.

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered by this Court, that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United Mine Workers of America et al., Petitioners,
29 vs.
Coronado Coal Company et al;
and
United Mine Workers of America et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
31 vs.
Coronado Coal Company et al.

On motion of Mr. William A. Glasgow, Jr., in that behalf, these cases were reassigned for March 20th next.

Edward O'Donnell, Plaintiff in Error,
81 vs.
The People of the State of Illinois;

Leonard Banks and Frank Bender, Plaintiffs in Error,
82 vs.
The People of the State of Illinois;

Frank Bender, Plaintiff in Error,
83 vs.
The People of the State of Illinois;

and.

John Boone, Plaintiff in Error,
84 vs.
The People of the State of Illinois.

These cases were passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to section 9, rule 26.

John Hill, Jr., et al., Appellants,
616 vs.
Henry C. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture, et al.

The argument herein was concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellees. Leave was granted appellants to file reply brief within twenty-four hours.

First National Bank of Jasper, Florida, Petitioner,
73 vs.
State Bank of Rome, Georgia;

First National Bank of Jasper, Florida, Petitioner,
74 vs.
The First National Bank of Rome, Georgia;

The Bank of Jasper, Petitioner,
76 vs.
The First National Bank of Rome, Georgia; and

The Bank of Jasper, Petitioner,
77 vs.
The State Bank of Rome, Georgia.

The argument herein was commenced by Mr. F. P. Fleming for the petitioners in Nos. 76 and 77; continued by Mr. Henry C. Clark for the respondents; by Mr. W. E. Kay for the respondents; and concluded by Mr. F. P. Fleming for the petitioners in Nos. 76 and 77. The cases were submitted by Mr. William Wade Hampton for the petitioners in Nos. 73 and 74.

Pueblo of Laguna, Appellant,
75 vs.
Jose Candelaria et al.

The argument herein was commenced by Mr. Francis C. Wilson for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, January 13th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that Elwood G. Godman, Esquire, and John Strother Boyd, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence R. Wilson, it is ordered that James C. Collins, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Sutherland, it is ordered that Frederic E. Klein, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ewing H. Scott, it is ordered that Harry Hess, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Harr, it is ordered that Charles A. Affonkraut, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Lee Roy E. Keeley, Appellant,
279 vs.
Walter H. Evans, as District Attorney of Multnomah County, State of Oregon, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pueblo of Laguna, Appellant,
75 vs.
Jose Candelaria et al.

The argument herein was continued by Mr. F. C. Wilson for the appellant, and concluded by Mr. Frank W. Clancy for the appellees.

Gertrude M. Reed, Administratrix, etc., Petitioner,
78 vs.
Director General of Railroads, etc.

The argument herein was commenced by Mr. John J. McDevitt, Jr., for the petitioner, continued by Mr. William Clarke Mason for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. John J. McDevitt, Jr., for the petitioner.

The United States, Appellant,
80 vs.
Isaac T. Cook, Executor, etc., et al.

The argument herein was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Lovett for the appellant, continued by Mr. William R. Harr for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Lovett for the appellant.

Kansas City Motion Picture Machine Operators, etc., et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
85 vs.
John E. Hughes et al., etc.

This case was argued by Mr. Charles M. Miller for the defendants in error, and was submitted by Mr. William J. Hughes, Mr. Frank P. Walsh, and Mr. Joseph W. Folk for the plaintiffs in error.

Edward Johnson, Plaintiff in Error,
88 vs.
The State of South Carolina.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff

in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Gooch, Jr., Petitioner,

90 vs.

Oregon Short Line Railroad Company.

The argument herein was commenced by Mr. J. H. Peterson for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, January 16th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Attorney General Daugherty, it is ordered that Samuel J. Flickinger, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Warren P. Martin, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Morganston, Jr., it is ordered that James Lane Donahue, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas J. Johnston, it is ordered that Manvel Whittemore, Esquire, and Lucius Everett Varney, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George T. Bell, it is ordered that Bernard L. Glover, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John L. Cable, it is ordered that Ray Martin, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Mr. Attorney General Daugherty presented to the Court the following resolutions:

Edward Douglass White, ninth Chief Justice of the United States, was born in Thibodeaux, Lafourche Parish, State of Louisiana, on the 3d day of November, 1845, and died in the City of Washington on the 19th day of May, 1921.

When but sixteen years of age, and yet at school, the Civil War broke out. He thereupon laid aside his books, returned to his home, and, as a private of infantry, espoused the cause of the Confederate States.

After the close of the Civil War, he undertook the study of the law, and in 1868 was admitted to practice at the Bar of the Supreme Court of Louisiana.

In 1874, he was elected to the State Senate, in which body he served for four years, when, by appointment, he became an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of Louisiana. He faithfully discharged the duties of that office until the reorganization of the Court in 1879, when he resumed the practice of the law. On March 4th, 1891, having been elected by the Legislature of Louisiana, he assumed the office of Senator of the United States, which he filled with distinction until February 19th, 1894.

By appointment of President Cleveland, and with the immediate and unanimous consent of the Senate, he then became an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Sixteen years of service as an Associate Justice so firmly established his reputation and character as a jurist that, upon the death of Chief Justice Fuller, President Taft, himself a lawyer of distinction and of a different political party, commissioned him on December 12th, 1910, Chief Justice of the United States.

On December 19th, 1910, he assumed the central seat upon that historic Bench, from which, with ability unsurpassed, he fulfilled until his death the duties of his greatest office.

Of his seventy-five years of life, almost one-half was devoted to the public good, six years in the service of his native State, and thirty years in that of the Nation, which he served with singleness of purpose and intensity of devotion.

As Associate Justice and Chief Justice, together, for twenty-seven years, he labored upon the Bench of this great Court, and, by patience, courtesy and fulness of learning, combined with an exceptional ability to grasp

and correllate, not only intricate masses of detail, but divergent systems of law, he constructed for himself, while striving for the benefit of others, a monument as enduring as the Court itself.

What he said aptly of his immediate predecessor is applicable precisely to himself: "His labors find an enduring memorial in the reported decisions of the Court rendered during the long period of his service. * * * They have become the heritage of his countrymen, for whose good he labored with untiring devotion."

It is accordingly RESOLVED by the members of the Bar of the Supreme Court of the United States here assembled, speaking for the membership of that Bar at large and voicing the grief of their brethren throughout the United States:

THAT the services of the late Chief Justice constitute a notable contribution to the achievements of the great tribunal of which he was so long an illustrious member; that by his modest bearing, his sense of kinship with his fellow-men, his wholesome outlook upon life, and his vigorous support of American institutions and ideals, no less than by the height of his intellect and the depth of his learning, he has left to his countrymen a memory at once an ennobling inspiration and a priceless example.

IT IS FURTHER RESOLVED that the Attorney General of the United States be requested to present these resolutions to the Court and to move their inscription upon its records; and that the Chairman of this meeting send a copy of the Resolutions to Mrs. White as an expression of the sympathy of the American Bar.

May it please Your Honors:

There is no higher virtue among any people than the reverence in which it holds the memory of its illustrious dead. To commemorate the life of a man who has spent his days in useful service to his country is not only a just tribute to him, but is distinctively an example for those who follow after him. The richest heritage that any nation can have is the record of the lives and services of its distinguished sons who have devoted themselves unselfishly and faithfully to the cause of their country. Such lives furnish inspiration, give faith, point the way, and stimulate others to useful service. Hence, it is deemed fitting that these resolutions be presented to this Court to commemorate the life and public labors of its late Chief Justice, who for twenty-seven years rendered most distinguished and useful

service to his country as a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Edward Douglas White, late Chief Justice of the United States, was born in LaFourche Parish, Louisiana, November 3, 1845. He died in the City of Washington at two o'clock in the morning on May 19, 1921. He was a soldier in the Confederate Army at the age of sixteen, entering in 1861; was taken prisoner at the fall of Port Hudson July 6, 1863; received his education in Mount St. Mary's College, near Emmittsburg, Maryland; at the Jesuit College, New Orleans, Louisiana, and at Georgetown University, Washington, D. C. He was admitted to the Louisiana Bar in 1868, and immediately manifested an active interest in politics. He was elected to the State Senate of Louisiana in 1874, and was later appointed an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of Louisiana in 1878, at the age of thirty-three. After serving with distinction and ability in this capacity he relinquished public office to resume the practice of law. For a time he was chairman of the board of examiners for admission to the bar of Louisiana and was also a member of the board of administrators of Tulane University, of New Orleans.

The high order of ability which he manifested while Associate Justice upon the Louisiana Supreme Bench, and the courageous and able fight which he made for clean government in Louisiana, and especially on account of his efforts against the Louisiana State lottery, which finally resulted in ridding the State of this evil, so impressed the people of that State that he was elected to a seat in the United States Senate, commencing his term March 4, 1891.

His call, however, was to the judicial and not to legislative service, for upon February 19, 1894, in the forty-ninth year of his age, President Cleveland appointed him an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, and he took the oath of office on March 12th of that year.

After a service of nearly seventeen years as an Associate Justice upon the Supreme Bench, during which time he displayed such marked ability that, as a recognition for eminent attainments and special fitness for this office, he received the crowning reward of all judicial service in this Government and was appointed Chief Justice of the United States by President Taft December 12, 1910, at the age of sixty-five, and took the oath on December 19, 1910, thereby succeeding Chief Justice Fuller as the ninth man to be appointed to this high office. Such, in brief, is the outline of the facts of the life and public service of the late Chief Justice.

Chief Justice White came to the Supreme Court of the United States a profound lawyer, an able jurist and statesman in the prime of life, the then youngest member of that body, with the full measure of physical strength, intellectual and moral endowment, and practical experience both as a lawyer and a statesman in public affairs, and was destined soon to take a leading place upon that Bench.

No greater eulogy can be pronounced upon Chief Justice White than to say that as Associate Justice for nearly seventeen years and later as Chief Justice for more than ten years, he responded in full measure to the requirements of that high office.

To be Chief Justice of the United States is the highest judicial honor in this country - in fact, in many ways it is the crowning honor that can come to any lawyer in the Nation - for in our whole history only ten men have occupied this position. Chief Justice White received this honor. He served his country well and his memory is entitled to the reverence of a grateful Nation.

The Supreme Court of the United States occupies a unique position in the political science of the world; in fact, it was our chief original contribution to the science of government. It is not only like the courts of last resort of other nations in that it makes decisions upon juristic questions, but it exercises the additional function of declaring laws, in proper cases, unconstitutional.

Great as is our debt to the Fathers who gave us the Constitution, it may still be questioned whether the work of Hamilton, Madison, and other constitutional Fathers would have been complete had not that long train of men from Marshall to White interpreted it and told us what it meant.

This Court has maintained its place, not by force, but by the power of logical reasoning, clear thinking, careful analysis, masterly argument, moral rectitude, and statesmanlike vision to see and to understand. The people, through the work of this Court, have come to realize what their Government is.

The function of the Supreme Court of the United States is of vital importance. It is the anchor which holds us to constitutional government, the ever-watchful guardian of the liberties of the people against transgression by legislative or executive action, the balance wheel holding in equipoise and true relationship the various parts of our complex system. What higher or

more noble work has ever been committed to the heart and hand and mind of man?

Chief Justice White was deeply conscious of the great responsibility devolving upon this Court. He realized fully the transcendent importance of its function and place in our system of government. He gave unreservedly all the power of his mighty intellect to upholding its dignity, its traditions, and its usefulness.

It has often occurred to me, and especially in studying the life of Chief Justice White, that this Court furnishes the most inspiring example of service, full, without stint, unselfishly given to the Nation. In this respect, men far past the age when they might retire, steadfastly remain at their posts. Chief Justice White for twenty-seven years labored faithfully in his work and died at his post in the service of his country. In this day, when men dare to scoff at the Constitution, when many prefer ease to the service of their country, when the whole world seems to have lost its balance and is in turmoil, it is indeed an inspiring hope to contemplate the lives and service of the men who have occupied this Bench. They furnish encouragement to those of us who believe in the Constitution, in our country, and in its destiny.

The period of Chief Justice White marked a great era for the Supreme Court of the United States. In the thirty years between the Civil War and the advent of Chief Justice White to the Bench, the Nation, by leaps and bounds, entered upon an era of industrial and commercial development unparalleled in the history of the world. This brought new problems.

As to the opinions written by Chief Justice White it may be said that it would be a very inadequate and therefore futile tribute to him to present in digest form the points decided in a few of the more than seven hundred masterly opinions that he wrote. Certain common characteristics run through all of these opinions. They bear evidence of a profound legal mind, painstaking investigation, a wealth of knowledge, a statesman-like vision to see the probable consequences resulting from such decision, and, above all, an intense belief in our constitutional system of government.

In all the work of the Court during this period Chief Justice White performed his full share. The record of his judicial labors is contained in 103 volumes of the opinions of this Court, as found in volumes 153 to 255, inclusive. During his incumbency upon the Supreme Bench the Court disposed of, in one way or another, more than 14,000 cases, and rendered opinions in

more than 7,000 cases. Chief Justice White wrote about 700 opinions for the Court, ten concurring opinions, and thirty-three dissenting opinions. These opinions cover the whole range of the work of the Court during this era. He was no specialist in that he confined his labors to any one particular field of work. On the contrary, his range of work was general and covered the main fields of litigation that came before the Court.

The first opinion that Chief Justice White wrote on any great constitutional question was a dissent in the case of Pollock v. Farmers' Loan and Trust Company, (157 U. S. 429), decided April 8, 1895. This opinion, delivered the first year after he came upon the Bench is a prophecy of the high rank he was to take as a jurist upon that Bench. In this first dissenting opinion he shows the characteristics as a jurist that followed him through his entire judicial career. The question before the Court was whether a tax by the Federal Government under the Revenue Law of 1894 upon certain incomes was a direct tax and therefore repugnant to the provisions of the Constitution requiring direct taxes to be levied according to the rule of apportionment.

A respect for precedent and a firm adherence to the doctrine of stare decisis are evidenced in this first opinion. After reviewing the history of all the cases from the beginning of the Government, showing that direct taxes within the meaning of the Constitution included only taxes on land and capitation taxes, he said:

> "And now, after a hundred years, after long continued action by other departments of the Government, and after repeated adjudications of this court, this interpretation is overthrown, and the Congress is declared not to have a power of taxation which may at some time, as it has in the past, prove necessary to the very existence of the Government." (157 U.S.637)

In this case Chief Justice White goes back of juristic arguments and reveals his political philosophy with reference to the doctrine of precedent and the sound reasons and principles upon which it is based. He takes the position that the Supreme Court is intended to be a stabilizing agency in making for certainty, uniformity, and fixedness of judicial decision, and says further that:

> "Break down this belief in judicial continuity, and let it be felt that on great constitutional questions this court is to depart from the settled conclusions of its predecessors, and to deter-

mine them all according to the mere opinion of those who temporarily fill its bench, and our Constitution will, in my judgment, be bereft of value and become a most dangerous instrument to the rights and liberties of the people."

This opinion also reveals another favorite method of legal analysis of Chief Justice White - that is, to test the soundness of any decision by following its effect to its logical consequence. This, it may be said with assurance, is one of the highest characteristics that any jurist can have who occupies a place in the Supreme Court of the United States. Again and again, running through the opinions of Chief Justice White is the principle that the statesman-jurist will not plant himself upon a decision that works ill in its ultimate results if he can find a ground that will work beneficially. On this point in the Pollock case he said:

> "The injustice of the conclusion points to the error of adopting it. ***** A rule which works out this result, which, it seems to me stultifies the Constitution by making it an instrument of the most greivous wrong, should not be adopted, especially when, in order to do so, the decisions of this Court, the opinions of the law writers and publicists, tradition, practice, and the settled policy of the government must be overthrown." (158 U. S. 712)

Closely akin to this last characteristic method, his argument on this point is that to limit or deny to Congress the power of direct taxation, as in this case, would mean that the Nation would no longer be supreme, but would be at the mercy of the State governments. He concludes this point by saying:

> "Hence, the decision now rendered, so far as taxing real and personal property and invested wealth is concerned, reduces the Government of the United States to the paralyzed condition which existed under the Confederation, and to remove which the Constitution of the United States was adopted." (158 U.S.714-715)

This opinion also gives the prophecy that Chief Justice White was a nationalist in political theory, believing and advocating that the National Government should be endowed with every power for its own functioning and should not be dependent upon the States to supply funds for conducting the Government. Here we see the soldier of the Confederacy, the idol of his native State, born and reared and steeped in the political philosophy of

States rights, developing in majestic splendor, and when the hour came for him under the responsibility of office, with broadening vision, we see him take his place as a worthy successor to Marshall as an apostle of nationalism. He protested against any decision in this case that would enfeeble the National Government and make it a helpless prey to the whim or caprice of the States. He lived to see the triumph of these views. After a lapse of twenty-one years they became the law of the land by the Sixteenth Amendment to the Constitution. That he fully realized this is seen from the statement in the case of Brushaber vs. Union Pacific Railroad Company (240 U.S. 1), in which the income tax provisions of the Tariff Act of 1913 were before the Court. Rendering the opinion he said:

> "Indeed in the light of the history which we have given and of the decision in the Pollock case and the ground upon which the ruling in that case was based, there is no escape from the conclusion that the Amendment was drawn for the purpose of doing away for the future with the principle upon which the Pollock case was decided. ******* (240 U. S. 18)

Another opinion especially important in illustrating the characteristics of Chief Justice White as a jurist is that of Knowlton vs. Moore (178 U.S.41), decided May 14, 1900. The main question involved in this case was whether a tax upon legacies under the War Revenue Act of 1898 was a direct tax, and therefore subject to apportionment, or whether indirect, and therefore in violation of the rule of uniformity. Chief Justice White reviewed the inheritance tax laws of Rome and other ancient nations and the modern law of France and other continental countries, as well as those of England and her colonies, and declared that an examination of all shows that -

> "tax laws of this nature in all countries rest in their essence upon the principle that death is the generating source from which the particular taxing power takes its being, and that it is the power to transmit, or the transmission from the dead to the living, on which such taxes are more immediately rested." (178 U. S. 56)

Hence, the opinion held that the tax levied was upon the right to inherit, and not upon the property itself. Being a tax upon the right instead of upon the property, it was in the nature of an excise tax, and

hence indirect. For wealth of learning, thorough familiarity with the literature of the subject - economic, historical and juristic - the discussion of Chief Justice White in this opinion has few superiors in our American jurisprudence. It is a genuine contribution to the jurisprudence of our country on the subject of taxation with reference to the devolution of property by inheritance or will. It fully vindicates and demonstrates the value of the study of comparative jurisprudence. Chief Justice White, profoundly learned in the jurisprudence of ancient and modern times, with a wealth of comparative knowledge of the civil as well as the common law, was able to bring his civil law knowledge to bear as the handmaid to assist the common law when necessary, but was wise and judicious enough never, in a pedantic way, to force the discusion of the civil law in his opinions unless it was necessary and vitally contributive as an aid to the development of his subject.

Neither the time nor the occasion permits an extended discussion of the Insular cases. In working out the problems incident to these cases Chief Justice White made his full contribution of labor, of thought, and of learning. Starting as a dissenter, his views and those of others associated with him finally prevailed and became the rule of law for the Court, and in the last of these cases, (Rasmussen vs. United States, 197 U.S. 516) he was able to write the opinion, reaffirming the views that he and his associates had held from the beginning, for the majority of the Court.

Among the most famous of the opinions of Chief Justice White are those defining the powers of Congress under the commerce clause of the Constitution and legislation thereunder, such as the Anti-Sherman Trust Act of July 2, 1890, in which opinions the so-called rule of reason was announced. His position on this subject first occurs in a dissenting opinion in the case of United States v. Trans-Missouri Freight Association (166 U.S. 290), delivered in 1896. The Court had occasion to consider this subject in other cases during the succeeding fourteen years, and the attitude of the Court on this question was such that at the end of this interval the Chief Justice was able to write the opinion for the Court, in 1910, in the case of Standard Oil Company v. United States (221 U. S.1), and in the case of United States v. American Tobacco Company, (221 U. S. 106). Speaking for the Court he said: "Applying the rule of reason to the construction of the statute, it was held in the Standard Oil case that as the words "restraint of trade" at common law and in the law of this country at the time of the adoption of the Anti-Trust

operated to the prejudice of the public interests by unduly restricting competition, or unduly obstructing the due course of trade or which, either because of their inherent nature or effect, or because of the evident purpose of the acts, etc., injuriously restrained trade, that the words as used in the statute were designed to have and did have but a like significance." (221 U. S. 179)

Chief Justice White never permitted economic theory to dominate his views of constitutional law. This is shown in the Pollock case, where he stood for the historic definition of the Fathers as to direct taxes rather than to accept the definition as given by the economists in 1895. Likewise, he held his social and political philosophy subordinate to his juristic views of the Constitution. He did not believe that because legislation was desirable it was therefore constitutional. He should not, however, for this reason, be classed as opposed to progress and as opposed to an interpretation of the Constitution as a living vital organism adapted to Twentieth Century needs. A careful study of the two cases, Lochner vs. New York (198 U. S. 45) and Hammer vs. Dagenhart (247 U. S. 251), as types of many other similar cases, will show that his position must be explained upon the theory of constitutional law and not upon any theory of social philosophy. He supported social welfare legislation by the States in the exercise of their police power. He opposed any definition enlarging the power of Congress to regulate commerce or any other power of the Federal Constitution to enact similar legislation, where such legislation, as he thought, was an exercise of the police power reserved to the States.

Closely akin to this subject it may be said that he was no extreme advocate of absolute liberty, either of person or of contract, nor did he believe in the unnecessary extension of governmental control over individuals. In an address before the American Bar Association at Montreal, Canada, in 1913, introducing the Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain, after epitomizing the experiences of Roman government and the history of the development of jurisprudence as illuminated by the teachings of Christianity, he said:

"When analyzed, these conceptions give the clearest apprehension of the rudimentary truths underlying all constitutional systems of government, and demonstrate that mere questions of municipal law are of minor importance when compared with the fundamental considerations which are at the basis of the preservation of free institutions; that is, the conserva-

willingness of one to submit to such restraints upon his own conduct as are essential to the preservation of the rights of all. In other words, the power of a free people to restrain themselves in order that freedom may endure."

Chief Justice White was a believer in the Constitution, yet he saw the dangers resulting from an abuse of the Constitution by those who seek to invoke it through the agency of our judiciary for their own purposes as against the legitimate rights of all the people. In an address delivered before the American Bar Association in this city, in October 1914, he said: "There is great danger, it seems to me, to arise from the constant habit which prevails where anything is opposed or objected to, of resorting without rhyme or reason to the Constitution as a means of preventing its accomplishment, thus creating the general impression that the Constitution is but a barrier to progress instead of being the broad highway through which alone true progress may be enjoyed."

Nature was kind to Chief Justice White. The elements were so mixed in him that he was destined to be one of earth's noblemen. His profound mind in all its manifestations was supplemented by a largeness of personality and of life. He was a man of dignity, yet his dignity was a natural manifestation of a great soul rather than of any conscious effort. He had the modesty, the simplicity, and the tenderness of a child, yet a firmness and courage that made him a power in any cause in which he believed. He was no egotist. In everything that he has written about himself, as well as in his personal demeanor, there is a significant absence of anything that would bear the impress of self-glorification. He was consideratoness itself for those about him. To the members of the Court, to the members of the bar, to all with whom he came in contact, whether rich or poor or of high or low degree, he manifested a kindly considerate spirit. He was courteous and polite, but he was far more than polite. Courtesy and politeness are sometimes formal rules of conduct. In him, they were the outward expression of a nature that loved human fellowship. High official position, great learning, raised no impulse of false pride in him. He was deeply conscious of the great obligations that power brought with it. With a keen sense of responsibility, he cheerfully set forth for the accomplishment of his work and humbly fashioned his life to render service. He was humble, yet his humility was not that superficial deference that one man formally pays to another. His great mind had penetrated far enough into spiritual things to

understand the smallness of man in the infinite purpose of God. Of him it could truly be said that his purpose was to do justice, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with his God. He had the true humanitarian spirit. He loved his fellowman. Those who came in contact with him felt the radiance of his nature, and men everywhere loved him. Such a nature as his must have been the inspiration of Lowell when he wrote those beautiful lines containing life's truest philosophy:

"Be noble! And the nobleness that lies in other men, sleeping but never dead, will rise in majesty to meet thine own."

All these qualities of personal endowment, together with a tact and skill in his relationship to those about him, rarely equalled, combined to make him a leader of men. As leader of this Court he will rank among the great Chief Justices - certainly the equal of any since the days of Marshall.

In closing I can describe this great statesman and gifted jurist in no better way than to use his own eloquent words. Speaking on a similar occasion of one of his colleagues on the Bench - Mr. Justice Lamar - he said: "O true American and devoted public servant, O cherished friend and faithful comrade, O sweet and noble soul, may it be vouchsafed that the results of your work may endure and fructify for the preservation of the rights of mankind, and may there be given to us who remain, wiping from our eyes the mists begotten by your loss, to see that through the mercy of the inscrutable providence of God you have been called to rest and to your exceeding reward!"

The Chief Justice responded:

Mr. Attorney General, the resolutions of the Bar and the words in which you present them are an appropriate expression of the inestimable loss which the people of this country and the members of the Bar feel in the death of Chief Justice White. Expressions of sympathy and appreciation of his high standing as a jurist before the World from the Lord Chancellor of England and the Bar of that country, have been forwarded to the Court and will be preserved in its records.

Twenty-seven years of service upon this Bench, sixteen years as an Associate Justice, and eleven years as head of the Court, make Chief Justice White's record nearly equal to that of John Marshall. The critical period covered by the span of so many years, beginning early in the last decade of one century and extending into the third of the next, likens itself in

importance to that covered by the term of the great Interpreter of the Constitution. It embraced two wars, and a period of serious social and business reforms involving substantial and necessary changes in our methods of government, with the application of which this Court has had much to do. In the necessary adjustment, the opinions of Chief Justice White were most able and helpful contributions.

The enormous material expansion of the latter half of the Nineteenth Century developed a corporate power and political control through wealth which threatened the welfare of the Republic, and the abuses then existing led to the enactment of most far-reaching remedial legislation.

The Anti-Trust Act directed toward dangerous restraints of trade and monopolies, necessarily couched in words of general import, required the adjudication of this Court to interpret its meaning and apply the remedies to the evil which its framers had in mind.

The interpretation of the Sherman Act by Chief Justice White, in his opinion in the Standard Oil case, is monumental and the most satisfactory exposition of its purpose and scope in the books.

Of the same period, and responding to the same popular impulse was the income tax, and the great difference of opinion in this Court as to its constitutionality was followed by a popular reversal of the judgment of the majority through constitutional means. Mr. Justice White was one of the minority in that case, and it remained for him, as Chief Justice, speaking for a unanimous Court, to interpret the Amendment which made the opinion of the minority the fundamental law.

The capital importance which our railroad system has come to have in the welfare of this country made the judicial construction of the Interstate Commerce Act of critical moment. It is not too much to say that Chief Justice White in construing the measure and its great amendments has had more to do with placing this vital part of our practical government on a useful basis than any other Judge. His opinions in the case of the Texas and Pacific Railway Company vs. the Abilene Cotton Oil Company, and the cases which followed it, are models of clear and satisfactory reasoning which gave to the people, to state legislatures, to Congress and the Courts a much-needed knowledge of the practical functions the Commerce Commission was to discharge, and of how they were to be reconciled to existing governmental machinery, for the vindication of the rights of the public in respect of

National Transportation. They are a conspicuous instance of his unusual and remarkable power and facility in statesmanlike interpretation of statute law.

The Interstate Commerce Commission was authorized to exercise powers, the conferring of which by Congress would have been perhaps thought in the earlier years of the Republic to violate the rule that no legislative power can be delegated. But the inevitable progress and exigencies of government and the utter inability of Congress to give the time and attention indispensable to the exercise of these powers in detail forced the modification of the rule. Similar necessity caused Congress to create other bodies with analogous relations to the existing legislative, executive and judicial machinery of the Federal Government, and these in due course came under the examination of this Court. Here was a new field of administrative law which needed a knowledge of government and an experienced understanding of our institutions safely to define and declare. The pioneer work of Chief Justice White in this field entitles him to the gratitude of his countrymen.

The chief question presented by the Spanish War was the application of the Constitution to the new possessions of the government. We were to administer them for the benefit of their peoples of races alien to ours and with but little understanding of our free institutions. Was there elasticity enough in our governmental structure to permit this to be done with the application of specific constitutional guaranties of liberty sacred to the traditions of our people, but dangerous and impracticable in a society untrained in their use?

After much difference of opinion between the members of the Court, the distinction in the rigid application of these guaranties as between territory acquired by the United States and belonging to it, and territory thereafter incorporated by Congress into the Union, originally insisted on by Mr. Justice White, became the settled opinion of the Court and the law of the land. It enabled our Government to do a beneficent colonial work for retarded peoples. The once genuine fear of imperialistic tendency from the distinction has faded away.

The enlargement of the national governmental functions by the use of the regulatory power over commerce among the states, in the lottery statute, the pure food act, the white slave act and other measures, a power which in these forms of exercise had lain dormant since the beginning of the govern-

ment, was actively employed to suppress growing evils. All presented new remedial legislation requiring accurate construction with a view to keeping within the limits fixed by the fundamental law, on the one hand, and giving effect to their beneficent purpose, on the other. Here, too, the genius of Chief Justice White as a statesman and a jurist shone forth.

In the World War, his opinions supporting statutes enacted to enable the Government to carry on the struggle, to mass all its resources of men and money in the country's defense, and to restrain sinister efforts to obstruct it, reveal an intense patriotic appreciation of the necessity of vesting full powers in the nation when its integrity is threatened and of the existence of ample authority to this end in the Constitution. The Chief Justice in the Selective Draft case delivered one of his great opinions.

Any association with Chief Justice White left no doubt of the force and strength of his convictions. Massive, dignified, impressive as was his physical mould, his mental structure was like it. There is an indefinable something about a leader of men that we call "personality", difficult to define, but which makes itself felt wherever they are. This quality Chief Justice White had in a marked degree. In the settlement of every issue, he had to be reckoned with. With lofty ideals as a statesman, with profound learning, with a love of logical processes and of the manifestation of them in his exposition of his views, he drove home his conclusion with a confidence and a convincing assurance that distinguishes his judicial expression.

His capacity for work was enormous. During his service on the Bench, the Court disposed in one way or another of 13,000 cases, and he himself prepared more than 800 opinions for the Court. The number of opinions is usually made the measure of a judge's work, but it is only a part of it. The study of cases with a view to their decision in conference is the greater task and this varies with the individual judge and with his conscience and feeling of responsibility. No one could be more sensitive in this regard than Chief Justice White. He carried for eleven years the additional burden of the executive direction of the Court. In his later years, he did his work with the burden of growing physical defects entailing obstacle and suffering, which he refused to betray, and to which he would not yield. His whole being was absorbed by his anxious concern for the maintenance of the prestige of the Court in the preservation of the Constitution and the upholding of its principles. He took infinite pains even in the lesser details of his duties. He regarded his office as a sacred trust, as a Holy Grail, which awakened an

intense scrutiny of his own conduct and of that of every member of the Court.

Of the story of his life, which began as a soldier of the Confederacy at 16 years, and the quick recognition of his power for usefulness from his early professional beginnings until by noteworthy steps he reached this Bench, there is not time to speak. His leadership of the long but successful fight against the lottery evil in Louisiana showed how formidable he was in organization and how courageous in action. His power as a speaker was only revealed in later years by the few addresses he was induced reluctantly to make to the American Bar Association. At Montreal and Washington his hearers were captivated by the grace and fluency of his diction, the exquisite charm, dignity and force of his bearing, and the depth of his expressed conviction. His touching metaphor to illustrate his own change of heart toward "Old Glory", of the fading of the gray of the Confederacy into the blue of the Union, "the invisible blue" as he adapted it from the moving story of the Cricket on the Hearth, will never fade from the memory of those who were privileged to hear him.

Edward Douglass White was the exemplary citizen, the considerate neighbor and friend, and the loving husband. He had a great heart, full of sympathy for mankind. He had an unfailing courtesy and a sweetness of manner which endeared him to all with whom he was associated. The strength and ruggedness and dignity of his character were stamped in his face, and these things but lent a peculiar charm to his gentleness and kindly manner. He was a gentleman of the old school.

Of his personal relations to the members of the Court in the intimacy of conference, I cannot of course speak from personal experience. They are shown in the touching words in which, immediately after his death, the Senior Associate Justice of this Court, so long a loved and loving comrade in service with Chief Justice White, expressed the affectionate esteem in which the colleagues of this great Chief Justice held him. In closing this response for the Court to these resolutions, I can best express their estimate of his judicial work by quoting Mr. Justice McKenna when he said:

"Anticipating the future, I see no shadow on his fame or service. I venture to make comparisons. I make full concession of the recognized and distinguished merit of those who preceded him. I make full admission in assured prophecy of the ability of those who will succeed him, yet considering his qualities, their variety and degree, and estimating them, I dare

to say that he will forever keep, a distinct eminence among the Chief Justices of the United States."

The resolutions and the accompanying remarks will be entered upon the records of the court.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Sloan Shipyards Corporation et al., Appellants,
308 vs.
United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 6th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wabash Railway Company, Petitioner,
648 vs.
Miles Elliott.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Kansas City Court of Appeals, State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Kansas City Court of Appeals, State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Crown Die and Tool Company, Petitioner,
676 vs.
Nye Tool and Machine Works.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

H. S. Herrick, Petitioner,
628 vs.
A. Basletta.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the District Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, of the State of California.

On consideration of M

District Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The K. W. Ignition Company, Petitioner,
643 vs.
Ford Motor Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jacques Rousso, Petitioner,
654 vs.
Reuben E. Barber et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Walter Matthey, Petitioner,
656 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, etc.,
661 vs.
E. C. Akins.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein

to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Walker D. Hines, Director General of Railroads, et al., Petitioners,
662 vs.
John H. Butler et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William J. Jackson, Receiver, etc., Petitioner,
680 vs.
Perry D. White.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Appellate Court, First District, of the State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court, First District, of the State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
20, Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

It is ordered by this Court that Frederick S. Tyler, the Commissioner appointed to take and return testimony in this cause, be, and he is hereby, allowed seven thousand five hundred dollars ($7,500.00) compensation for his services as such Commissioner, and his expenses, as shown in his report, incurred in the discharge of his duties.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank H. Schurmann, Appellant,
144 vs.
The United States of America.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kansas City Motion Picture Machine Operators, etc., et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
85 vs.
John E. Hughes et al., etc.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

T. B. Stafford et al., copartners, etc., et al., Appellants,
687 vs.
Henry C. Wallace etc., et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf.

Ex parte in the matter of Essex Rubber Company, Petitioner.
---, Original.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of prohibition herein was submitted by Mr. Thomas J. Johnston and Mr. Lucius E. Varney for the petitioner in support of the motion, and by Mr. Charles A. Brown for the respondent in opposition thereto.

James Eugene Burton et al., Appellants,
691 vs.
Charles F. Clyne, United States District Attorney, etc.

The motion to advance and for stay was submitted by Mr. Levy Mayer for the appellants.

Public Service Electric Company et al., Appellants,
94 vs.
The Town of Westfield.

On motion of Mr. Chauncey B. Parker in that behalf, this case was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26.

Luther M. Nesmith, Plaintiff in Error,
133 vs.
The State of Ohio.

The motion to dismiss the writ of error herein was submitted by Mr. Ray Martin in behalf of Mr. John G. Price for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Smith W. Bennett and Mr. Benjamin F. James for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Thomas G. Watkins, Trustee, et al.,
Petitioners,
590 vs.
J. H. Sedberry et al.
Charles S. Lawrence for the respondents.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. C.C. Calhoun and Mr. Clarence T. Boyd for the petitioners, and by Mr.

Joslin Manufacturing Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
640 vs.
Walter L. Clarke, City Treasurer, et al.;
Scituate Light & Power Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
641 vs.
City of Providence et al.;
and
Theresa B. Joslin, Plaintiff in Error,
642 vs.
City of Providence et al.

The motion to advance and consolidate these causes was submitted by Mr. Albert A. Baker for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Robert H. McCarter, Mr. James Harris, Mr. Francis I. McCanna, and Mr. Alfred C. Chaffee for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Anaheim Sugar Company, Petitioner,
647 vs.
T. W. Jenkins & Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Donald Barker for the petitioner.

Walter S. Greevy, Petitioner,
658 vs.
The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Robert A. Henderson for the petitioner.

Leigh Ellis & Company, Plaintiff in Error,
685 vs.
James C. Davis, as Agent, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Edgar Watkins for the plaintiff in

and by Mr. Walter T. Colquitt and Mr. A. A. McLaughlin for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

Edgar A. Levy Leasing Company, Inc., Plaintiff in Error,
285 vs.
Jerome Siegel; and
810 West End Avenue, Inc.,
287 vs.
Henry R. Stern.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf, these causes are reassigned for hearing on Monday, January 23.

John Gooch, Jr., Petitioner,
90 vs.
Oregon Short Line Railroad Company.

The argument herein was continued by Mr. George H. Smith for the respondent, and was concluded by Mr. J. H. Peterson for the petitioner.

C. E. Schaff, as Receiver, etc., Plaintiff in Error,
91 vs.
J. C. Pamechon Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. C. W. Bunn for the plaintiff in error, and was submitted by Mr. Charles Burke Elliott for the defendant in error.

The Standard Fashion Company, Petitioner,
20 vs.
Magrane-Houston Company.

Leave was granted Mr. Solicitor General Beck to file brief herein, and to make oral argument, in place of respondent. The reargument was commenced by Mr. Herbert Noble for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Solicitor General Beck (by special leave) for the United States, as amicus curiae, and was concluded by Mr. Herbert Noble for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, January 17th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rufus S. Day, it is ordered that Gerald Hill, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry W. Dunn, it is ordered that Edward N. Chase, Esquire, of Concord, Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Tony Vigliotti, Plaintiff in Error,
530 vs.
The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. George E. Alter in that behalf.

The State of New Mexico, Complainant,
19, Original. vs.
The State of Colorado.

The motion for leave to file stipulation as to taking testimony herein was submitted by Mr. William R. Ramsey in that behalf.

Robert Hawes, Plaintiff in Error,
95 vs.
The State of Georgia.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Marion Smith for the plaintiff in error. No brief was filed for the defendant in error.

Charles L. Burrill, Treasurer, etc., Plaintiff in Error,
98 vs.
Locomobile Company; and

Charles L. Burrill, Treasurer, etc., Plaintiff in Error,
99 vs.
Russell, Miller Milling Company.

On motion of Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., in that behalf, these causes were passed, to be restored to the call when No. 113 is reached.

Tom J. Terral, as Secretary of State of the State of Arkansas, Appellant,
93 vs.
Burke Construction Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt for the appellee. The Court declined to hear further argument.

United Shoe Machinery Corporation et al., Appellants,
119 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Charles F. Choate for the appellants, six hours were allowed for the argument of this cause. The argument was commenced by Mr. Charles F. Choate for the appellants, and was continued by Mr. LaRue Brown for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, January 18th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices.
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
John H. Clarke,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merrill Moores, it is ordered that Larz A. Whitcomb, Esquire, and Charles P. Stewart, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick P. Fish, it is ordered that Wilbur B. Jones, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roy G. Fitzgerald, it is ordered that Alfred C. Fox, Esquire, of Bluefield, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry L. Myers, it is ordered that Washington J. McCormick, Esquire, of Missoula, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Fred Leach, doing business as Organo Product Company, Appellant,
105 vs.
William B. Carlile, Postmaster.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Lee D. Mathias for the appellant, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant

S. Ridgely for the appellee.

United Shoe Machinery Corporation et al., Appellants,
119 vs.
The United States of America.

The reargument of this cause was continued by Mr. LaRue Brown for the appellee, by Mr. Elias Field for the appellee, and was concluded by Mr. Frederick P. Fish for the appellants.

Continental Insurance Company et al., Appellants,
609 vs.
The United States et al; and

Seward Prosser et al., Appellants,
610 vs.
The United States et al.

On motion of Mr. Alfred A. Cook in that behalf, three hours were allowed for the argument of this cause. The argument was commenced by Mr. Alfred A. Cook for the appellants in No. 609, and was continued by Mr. R. C. Leffingwell for the Reading Company.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, January 19th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices.

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke,

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George W. Wickersham, it is ordered that Allen McCarty, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John M. Harrington, it is ordered that Walter C. Sheppard, Esquire, Charles J. Nehrbas, Esquire, and Ralph O. Willguss, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Howard Boyd, it is ordered that Guy M. Boyer, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Basil Robillard, it is ordered that Ray M. Stanley, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Cook, it is ordered that Frederick P. Greenman, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lucian W. Parrish, it is ordered that R. E. Minton, Esquire, of Lufkin, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles D. Drayton, it is ordered that John R. Turney, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Atchafalaya Land Company, Limited, et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
106 vs.
F. B. Williams Cypress Company, Limited.

On motion of Mr. C. F. Consaul in that behalf, this cause was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to section 9, rule 26.

Continental Insurance Company et al., Appellants,
609 vs.
The United States et al.;
and
Seward Prosser et al., Appellants,
610 vs.
The United States et al.

The argument of these causes was continued by Mr. Ellis Ames Ballard for the appellee Joseph Widener; by Mr. Thomas Raeburn White for the appellees William B. Kurtz et al.; by Mr. George W. Wickersham for Adrian Iselin et al., appellees; and was concluded by Mr. Joseph M. Hartfield for the appellants in No. 610.

Julius F. Smietanka, as Collector, etc., Petitioner,
540 vs.
First Trust & Savings Bank, Trustee, etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Ottinger for the petitioner, and by Mr. John P. Wilson for the respondent.

New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Company, Appellant,
96 vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. S. S. Ashbaugh for the appellant, and by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, January 20th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George A. King, it is ordered that Wellington M. Bertolet, Esquire, of Reading, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Maurice D. Rosenberg, it is ordered that Samuel G. Mulloy, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William S. Hammer, it is ordered that Alfred L. Geiger, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Andrew S. Caldwell, it is ordered that Alfred D. Riess, Esquire, of Red Bud, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Marbury, it is ordered that James Arthur Phelps, Esquire, of Pueblo, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry F.

Ashurst, it is ordered that Frederic H. Bernard, Esquire, of Tucson, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Vincent M. Brennan, it is ordered that Lazarus S. Davidow, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Wyoming, Complainant,
3, Original. vs.
The State of Colorado et al.

The motion of Mr. James Henry Brown for leave to file a brief herein as amicus curiae was denied.

MacArthur Brothers Company,
Appellant,
97 vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. William B. King for the appellant, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Riter for the appellee.

Charles F. Wood et al., etc.,
Appellants,
100 vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. E. C. Brandenburg for the appellants, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Ottinger for the appellee.

Pine Hill Coal Company, Inc.,
Appellant,
101 vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. Henry S. Drinker, Jr., for the appellant, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Riter for the appellee.

Missouri Pacific Railroad
Company, Plaintiff in Error,
102 vs.
Clarendon Boat Oar Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Allan Sholars for the plaintiff in error. No brief was filed for the defendant in error.

Willard N. Jones,
Plaintiff in Error,
103 vs.
The United States of America.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Riter for the defendant in error, and was submitted by Mr. John H. Hall and Mr. Jay Bowerman for the plaintiff in error.

Gertrude Crane, as Administratrix, etc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
107 vs.
Louis H. Hahlo et al., as the Board
of Revision of Assessments, etc., et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. J. M. Harrington for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, January 23rd, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that William W. Hoppin, Esquire, and Samuel Isenschmid, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ewin L. Davis, it is ordered that William Henry Crowell, Esquire, of Shelbyville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward E. Blodgett, it is ordered that Charles Luff Pavinger, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry F. Ashurst, it is ordered that John Wilson Ross, Esquire, of Bisbee, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry H. Glassie, it is ordered that George Stewart Brown, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander

Armstrong, it is ordered that Lindsay C. Spencer, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Cox, it is ordered that O. Ellery Edwards, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Simon Fleischmann, it is ordered that Wilbur D. Wilkin, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Allan M. Smith, it is ordered that Walter J. Walsh, Esquire, of New Haven, and Henry J. Calnen, Esquire, of Hartford, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

State of North Dakota ex rel. William Lemke, Attorney General, Complainant, vs. Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company et al.

No. 25, Original.

This cause came on to be heard on the pleadings and proofs and was argued by counsel.

ON CONSIDERATION WHEREOF, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the bill of complaint herein be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice announced that the Court will take a recess from Monday, the 30th instant, until Monday, February 27th next.

U. S. Rubber Reclaiming Works et al., Petitioners,
707 vs.
The Philadelphia Rubber Works Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Simon Fleischmann, Mr. Hans von Briesen, and Mr. J. Edgar Bull for the petitioners, and by Mr. Charles Neave and Mr. William G. McKnight for the respondent.

Concrete Steel Company, Petitioner,
674 vs.
George E. Vandenburg.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Thomas J. Johnston and Mr. L. E. Varney for the petitioner, and by Mr. Carlos F. Griffin, Mr. O. Ellery Edwards, and Mr. Joseph W. Cox for the respondent.

Exporters of Manufacturers' Products (Inc.)
390 vs.
Butterworth-Judson Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Henry M. Ward for the Exporters of Manufacturers' Products (Inc.)

King County, Plaintiff in Error,
344 vs.
Hewitt-Lea Lumber Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John F. Miller and Mr. Malcolm Douglas in behalf of Mr. Howard A. Hanson for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition.

William W. Knights, Plaintiff in Error,
518 vs.
James Jackson, Treasurer and Receiver General.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. William Harold Kitchcock for the defendant in error.

The State of Connecticut, Plaintiff in Error,
711 vs.
Thomas McAuliffe.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Hugh M. Alcorn and Mr. Allan K. Smith for the plaintiff in error.

King County, Plaintiff in Error,
344 vs.
Hewitt-Lea Lumber Company.

The motion to dismiss the writ of error in this cause was submitted by Mr. W. E. Humphreys in behalf of Mr. James B. Howe for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Howard A. Hanson for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Wabash Railway Company, Petitioner,
677 vs.
W. Koenig et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney and Mr. Nat S. Brown for the petitioner, and by Mr. Clifford B. Allen for the respondent.

Charles H. Rowan, Petitioner,
682 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Charles H. Rowan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Electro Bleaching Gas Company,
Petitioner,
694 vs.
William G. Miller et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Drury W. Cooper and Mr. E. Henry Lacombe for the petitioner, and by Mr. Arthur C. Brown for the respondent.

Charles S. Fairchild, Appellant,
148 vs.
Charles E. Hughes, Secretary of State, et al.; and

Oscar Leser et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
553 vs.
J. Mercer Garnett et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf, these causes were advanced, to be heard after No. 107.

Gertrude Crane, as Administratrix, etc., Plaintiff in Error,
107 vs.
Louis H. Hahlo et al., as the Board of Revision of Assessments, etc., et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. John M. Harrington for the plaintiff in error, and was concluded by Mr. Charles J. Mehrbas for the defendant in error.

Charles S. Fairchild, Appellant,
148 vs.
Charles E. Hughes, Secretary of State, et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William L. Marbury for the appellant, continued by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Thomas F. Cadwalader for the appellant.

Monday, January 23rd, 1922, continued.

Oscar Leser et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
553 vs.
J. Mercer Garnett et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the United States, leave was granted to file brief herein on behalf of the United States as amicus curiae. The argument was commenced by Mr. Thomas F. Cadwalader for the plaintiffs in error, continued by Mr. Alexander Armstrong for the defendants in error, and by Mr. G. M. Brady for Caroline Roberts et al., defendants in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, January 24th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices.

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke,

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. Garland Dupre, it is ordered that Joseph A. Loret, Esquire, of Baton Rouge, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

William Irwin, Appellant,
110 vs.
Sam P. Webb, County Treasurer of Maricopa County, State of Arizona, et al.

Mr. Patrick H. Loughran, of counsel for the appellant, suggested the retirement from office of Sam P. Webb, as County Treasurer; C. W. Cummins, as County Assessor; L. M. Laney, as County Attorney; W. K. Bowen, as County Supervisor; and C. W. Peterson as County Supervisor of Maricopa County, State of Arizona, parties appellees in this cause, and moved the Court to make Vernon S. Wright, present County Treasurer; Harry Pierce, present County Assessor; R. E. L. Shepherd, present County Attorney; Guy P. Vernon, present County Supervisor, and C. S. Steward, present County Supervisor of Maricopa County, State of Arizona, parties appellees herein.

WHEREUPON, IT IS NOW HERE ORDERED BY THE COURT that Vernon S. Wright, present County Treasurer; Harry Pierce, present County Assessor; R. E. L. Shepherd, present County Attorney; Guy P. Vernon, present County Supervisor, and C. S. Steward, present County Supervisor of Maricopa County, State of Arizona, be, and they are hereby made parties appellees in this cause in the place of Sam P. Webb, former County Treasurer; C. W. Cummins, former County

Assessor; L. M. Laney, former County Attorney; W. K. Bowen, former County Supervisor, and C. W. Peterson, former County Supervisor of Maricopa County, State of Arizona, retired from office.

William Irwin, Appellant,
110 vs.
Sam F. Webb, County Treasurer, etc., et al.

This case was submitted by Mr. Patrick H. Loughran and Mr. Ernest W. Lewis for the appellant. No brief was filed for the appellees.

The State of Connecticut,
Plaintiff in Error,
711 vs.
Thomas J. McAuliffe.

The opposition to the motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Henry J. Calnen and Mr. Walter J. Walsh for the defendant in error.

The City of Dallas et al.,
Appellants,
478 vs.
Dallas Telephone Company.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties for the withdrawal of the motion of the appellee to dismiss, and to dismiss this appeal, has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oscar Leser et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
553 vs.
J. Mercer Garnett et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. G. M. Brady for Caroline Roberts et al., defendants in error, and was concluded by Mr. William L. Marbury for the plaintiffs in error.

Santa Fe Pacific Railroad Company, Appellant,
108 vs.
Albert B. Fall, Secretary of the Interior; and
Santa Fe Pacific Railroad Company, Appellant,
109 vs.
Albert B. Fall, Secretary

These causes were argued by Mr. F. W. Clements for the appellant, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Ritter for the appellee.

Edgar A. Levy Leasing Company, Inc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
285 vs.
Jerome Siegel; and

810 West End Avenue, Inc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
287 vs.
Henry R. Stern.

On motion of Mr. Louis Marshall in that behalf, four hours were allowed for the argument of these cases. The argument was commenced by Mr. Louis Marshall for the plaintiffs in error, and continued by Mr. William D. Guthrie for the joint legislative committee on housing of the New York Legislature.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, January 25th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. D. McKenney, it is ordered that Marion B. Pierce, Esquire, and Parker McCollester, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Felix T. Hughes, it is ordered that Clifton J. O'Harra, Esquire, and Lee Siebenborn, Esquire, of Carthage, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter C. Clephane, it is ordered that Gilbert L. Hall, Esquire, and Volney McFadden, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Abram H. Serven, it is ordered that Horatio A. Marshall, Esquire, of Waterloo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. Melendez King, it is ordered that John M. George, Esquire, of Jersey City, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney andcounsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Wednesday, January 25th, 1922, continued.

Leon Israel et al., etc., Appellants,
117 vs.
Moore & McCormack, Inc.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gustavus French Harvey et al., Appellants,
125 vs.
The Union Traction Company et al.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Gustavus French Harvey for the appellants and by Mr. John J. Jones for the appellees.

Edgar A. Levy Leasing Company, Inc., Plaintiff in Error,
285 vs.
Jerome Siegel; and
810 West End Avenue, Inc., Plaintiff in Error,
287 vs.
Henry R. Stern.

The argument of these causes was continued by Mr. William D. Guthrie and Mr. Julius Henry Cohen for the joint legislative committee on housing of the New York Legislature, and was concluded by Mr. Louis Marshall for the plaintiffs in error.

P. H. Harris, Appellant,
112 vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Ritter for the appellee, and the cause submitted by Mr. Charles B. Stuart, Mr. J. E. Sharp, and Mr. M. K. Cruce for the appellant.

Charles L. Burrill, Treasurer, etc., Plaintiff in Error,
98 vs.
Locomobile Company; and

Charles L. Burrill,

Treasurer, etc.,

Plaintiff in Error,

99 vs.

Russell, Miller Milling

Company.

The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. William Harold Hitchcock for the plaintiff in error and continued by Mr. William P. Everts for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, January 26th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. Riter, it is ordered that Henry E. Warner, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi H. David, it is ordered that William F. Kimber, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Robert H. Strahan, Appellant,
180 vs.
Howard G. Harvey et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Appellant,
127 vs.
Bethlehem Steel Company.

On motion of Mr. Assistant Attorney General Riter in that behalf, this cause was passed, per stipulation of counsel, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

The Southern Express Company,

Plaintiff in Error,

128 vs. P. B. Spigener, as Treasurer of Richland County.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles L. Burrill, Treasurer, etc., Plaintiff in Error,
98. vs. Locomobile Company;

and Charles L. Burrill, Treasurer, etc., Plaintiff in Error,
99 vs. Russell, Miller Milling Company.

The argument of these causes was concluded by Mr. William P. Everts for the defendant in error.

John L. Whiting-J. J. Adams Company, Plaintiffs in Error,
113 vs. Charles L. Burrill, Treasurer and Receiver General, etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles L. Pavinger for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. William Harold Hitchcock for the defendant in error.

The United States, Petitioner,
114 vs. M. Rice & Company et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Hoppin for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. Stuart Tompkins for the respondents.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,
115 vs. Izard County Highway Improvement District No. 1.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Edward J. White, Mr. Thomas B. Pryor, and Mr. Samp Jennings for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Joseph S. Utley for the defendant in error.

Commissioners of Road Improvement
District No. 2 of Lafayette County,
Arkansas, Petitioners,
141 vs.
St. Louis Southwestern Railway
Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Henry Moore, Jr., for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, January 27th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Manton M. Wyvell, it is ordered that George H. Harris, Esquire, of Rochester, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward E. Blodgett, it is ordered that Adolph William Boyken, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California; and George L. Dillaway, Esquire, and George R. Farnum, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George M. Morris, it is ordered that Newton Jenkins, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. B. Swank, it is ordered that Hunter L. Johnson, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Thomas G. Watkins, Trustee, et al., Petitioners, vs. J. H. Sedberry et al. 690

On motion of Mr. C. C. Calhoun for the petitioners, leave was granted to file memorandum for the petitioners.

Commissioners of Road Improvement, District No. 2, of Lafayette County, Arkansas, Petitioners,
141 vs.
St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. J. H. Turney for the respondent, and was concluded by Mr. Henry Moore, Jr., for the petitioners.

Hamilton S. Wallace, Appellant,
118 vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. H. Stanley Hinrichs and Mr. Frank S. Bright for the appellant, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Ottinger for the appellee.

Keokuk & Hamilton Bridge Company, Appellant,
130 vs.
Fred Salm, Jr., et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Felix T. Hughes for the appellant, and by Mr. Lee Siebenborn and Mr. Clifton J. O'Hara for the appellees.

New Bedford Dry Dock Company, Appellant,
131 vs.
Blake G. Purdy, Claimant of the Steamer "Jack-O-Lantern".

This cause was argued by Mr. George R. Farnum for the appellant, and by Mr. George L. Dillaway for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, January 30th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. Hamilton, it is ordered that Clarence O. Wood, Esquire, of East Orange, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Herbert Parsons, it is ordered that William B. Carnochan, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward J. Henning, it is ordered that J. Edward Keating, Esquire, of San Diego, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. W. Harreld, it is ordered that A. J. Hardy, Esquire, of Ardmore, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. P. Freeling, it is ordered that Horace H. Hagan, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma,

be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John E. Benton, it is ordered that Harwell Goodwin Davis, Esquire, of Montgomery, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Manton M. Wyvell, it is ordered that Andrew T. Smith, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rufus S. Day, it is ordered that Vernon S. Jones, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Georgia, Complainant, vs. The State of South Carolina. No. 16, Orig'l. This cause came on to be heard by this Court, and, for the purpose of carrying into effect the conclusions of the Court as stated in its opinion herein,

IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that the boundary between the States of Georgia and South Carolina is and shall be the rivers Savannah, Tugaloo and Chattooga to the point where the latter river touches the North Carolina line at the thirty-fifth parallel of North latitude; and the location of the boundary line between said States is hereby established and declared to be as set forth in the opinion of the Court, as follows:

1st. Where there are no islands in the boundary rivers, the location of the line between the two States is on the water midway between the main banks of the river when water is at ordinary stage;

2nd. Where there are islands, the line is midway between the island bank and the South Carolina shore when the water is at ordinary stage;

3rd. That all islands formed by nature in the Chattooga river are reserved to Georgia as completely as are those in the Savannah and Tugaloo Rivers.

4th. That the parties to this suit may at any time, by mutual consent,

locate and monument the boundary line in any part of the boundary rivers in accordance with the provisions of this decree.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that the costs of this suit shall be equally divided between the said two States, and that the Clerk of this Court shall forthwith transmit to the Chief Magistrates of the States of Georgia and South Carolina copies of this decree, duly authenticated under the Seal of the Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

International Railway Company,
Appellant,
340 vs.
George C. Davidson, Individually and as Collector of the Port of Buffalo, et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed

(see page 313)

with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

International Railway Company,
Appellant,
340 vs.
George C. Davidson, Individually and as Collector of the Port of Buffalo, et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

International Railway Company,
Petitioner,
340 vs.
George C. Davidson, Individually and as Collector of the Port of Buffalo, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

F. A. Gillespie, Plaintiff in Error,
322 vs.
The State of Oklahoma.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Pitney,
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

F. A. Gillespie, Plaintiff in Error,
322 vs.
The State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Charles Cornell, Appellant,
174 vs.
George H. Moore, Collector of Internal Revenue.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

George J. Ghio, Appellant,
175 vs.
George H. Moore, Collector of Internal Revenue.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

William H. Bryan, Appellant,
428 vs.
Joshua A. Miles, Collector of Internal Revenue of the United

States for the District of
Maryland, and Richard S.
Dodson, Federal Prohibition
Director for the State of
Maryland.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Walter A. Mastes, Appellant,
548 vs.
George F. Crutchley, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Sixth District of Missouri, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Ex parte, In the matter of
Essex Rubber Company, Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of prohibition or a writ of certiorari herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and

the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of New Mexico, Complainant, 19, Original. vs. The State of Colorado.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a stipulation as to taking testimony herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and, in pursuance thereof, that proofs shall be taken in this cause by an examiner or examiners designated in writing by agreement of said parties, to be approved by the Court, each of whom shall have authority to administer oaths to witnesses, and, before entering upon the discharge of his duties, shall take and subscribe an oath that he will faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all duties devolving upon him as such examiner, according to the best of his ability and understanding, to be filed with the clerk of this Court, together with the naming and designation of such examiner by said parties, and that such examiner or examiners, shall with all convenient speed, proceed to take all proofs which may be offered by said parties at such times and places as may be agreed on by said parties, or as may be designated by either of said parties upon ten days' notice to the opposing party, and shall reduce the same to writing, and shall note all objections to questions or answers or to the admissibility of any evidence offered, which may be made by either of said parties, provided that any such examiner shall be a competent stenographer and typist, and that his compensation shall be fifteen cents per folio of one hundred words of the original of the testimony, and five cents per folio for each carbon copy thereof he may, by either of said parties, be called upon to furnish, such compensation to be paid by the party for whom the testimony is taken or to whom such carbon copy or copies may be furnished; and provided further that such examiner shall not copy into his record any documentary evidence which may be offered, but he shall identify the same by appropriate markings as exhibits to be returned to this Court with his original record of the testimony taken, as a part thereof, which shall be a complete record of all proofs taken or offered, and of all proceedings in connection therewith, to the correctness of which he shall certify and file the same with the clerk of this Court; and it is further ordered that any matter appearing in the published statutes of Colorado, New Mexico, or of the United States, or in any Congressional document, or other published governmental record, pertaining to the issues

herein, shall be received as evidence without any further or other authentication than the publication thereof, subject, however, to any objections as to admissibility on any ground as to competency, materiality, or relevancy, other than authentication.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

T. B. Stafford and S. B. Stafford, Copartners, etc., et al., Appellants,
687 vs.
Henry C. Wallace, etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 20th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James Eugene Burton et al., Appellants,
691 vs.
Charles F. Clyne, United States District Attorney for the Northern District of Illinois.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 20th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Tony Vigliotti, Plaintiff in Error,
530 vs.
The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 13th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Exporters of Manufacturers Products (Inc.),
390 vs.
Butterworth-Judson Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 13th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Connecticut,
Plaintiff in Error,
711 vs.
Thomas McAuliffe.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 13th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William W. Knights,
Plaintiff in Error,
518 vs.
James Jackson, Treasurer and Receiver General.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, October 3d next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joslin Manufacturing Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
640 vs.
Walter L. Clarke, City Treasurer, et al.
Scituate Light & Power Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
641 vs.
The City of Providence et al.
Theresa B. Joslin,
Plaintiff in Error,
642 vs.
The City of Providence et al.

On consideration of the motions to advance and consolidate these cases, it is now here ordered by this Court that the motion to consolidate be, and the same is hereby, granted; and that the motion to advance be, and the same is hereby, denied, without prejudice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Luther M. Nesmith,
Plaintiff in Error,
133 vs.
The State of Ohio.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

King County, Plaintiff in Error,
344 vs.
Hewitt-Lea Lumber Company.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Concrete Steel Company,
Petitioner,
674 vs.
George E. Vandenburg.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas G. Watkins, Trustee, et al.,
Petitioners,
690 vs.
J. H. Sedberry et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Anaheim Sugar Company,
Petitioner,
647 vs.
T. W. Jenkins & Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that

the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Walter S. Creevy, Petitioner,
658 vs.
The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Leigh Ellis & Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
685 vs.
James C. Davis, as Agent, etc.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wabash Railway Company,
Petitioner,
677 vs.
W. Koenig et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles H. Rowan, Petitioner,
682 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Electro Bleaching Gas Company,
Petitioner,

694 vs.
William C.Miller et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument ofcounsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

U. S. Rubber Reclaiming Works et al., Petitioners, 707 vs. The Philadelphia Rubber Works Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Public Service Company et al., Appellants, 94 vs. The Town of Westfield.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. R. W. Parker, in behalf of counsel, and it appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, with costs to be paid to the appellee.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, 20, Original. vs. The State of Texas; The

On motion of Mr. C. Carroll Todd in that behalf, this cause was reassigned for argument on April 24th next.

The State of Minnesota, Complainant,
11, Original. vs.
The State of Wisconsin.

The motion for final decree herein was submitted by Mr. A. A. McLaughlin in that behalf.

United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, etc., Petitioner,
526 vs.
Roger B. Wood, Trustee, etc.,

On motion of Mr. Jesse C. Adkins in that behalf, this cause was advanced and assigned for Monday, March 6th next.

Local Union No. 2 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers et al., Petitioners,
695 vs.
Kinloch Telephone Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. J. S. Easby-Smith in behalf of Mr. John P. Leahy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Bruce A. Campbell and Mr. Edward C. Kramer for the respondent.

Rhode Island Hospital Trust Company, Administrator, etc., et al., Petitioners,
688 vs.
Kate Atwood et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Clarence Wilson in behalf of Mr. William R. Tillinghast, Mr. Herbert Barry, Mr. Walter P. Angell, and Mr. Eugene A. Kingman for the petitioners, and by Mr. Lyman R. Clark and Mr. Herbert Parsons for the respondents.

J. Dan Blackistone, Plaintiff in Error,
420 vs.
Leonard W. Groomes.

The motion to dismiss the writ of error in this cause was submitted by Mr. Joseph D. Sullivan for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
313 vs.
Wesley L. Sischo.

The motion for leave to file brief herein as amicus curiae was submitted by Mr. Vernon S. Jones in behalf of Mr. Cletus Keating for John Reed.

Walker D. Hines, Director General of Railroads, et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
240 vs.
Fred Mauldin.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to reverse the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause, has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Woodrow Parker Company et al., Petitioners,
666 vs.
Amos S. Herschberger, by his next friends, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Thomas H. Tracy, Mr. E. J. Marshall, and Mr. Harold W. Fraser for the petitioners, and by Mr. Charles A. Seiders for the respondent.

Sarah Schauffele, as Administratrix, etc., Petitioner,
692 vs.
John Barton Payne, Director General of Railroads, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Thomas J. O'Neill for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles E. Miller for the respondent.

Union Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner,
693 vs.
Elizabeth Mabel Perrin, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Henry W. Clark, Mr. H. H. Loomis, and Mr. George H. Smith for the petitioner.

Gans Steamship Line, Petitioner,
701 vs.
Isles Steamshipping Company, Limited.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John W. Griffin for the petitioner, and by Mr. John M. Woolsey for the respondent.

Gans Steamship Line, Petitioner,
702 vs.
George H. Arnot, Master and Claimant, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Clarence Bishop Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. John M. Woolsey for the respondents.

The State of Minnesota, Complainant,
11, Original. vs.
The State of Wisconsin.

The motion for final decree herein was submitted by Mr. A. A. McLaughlin in that behalf.

United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, etc., Petitioner,
526 vs.
Roger B. Wood, Trustee, etc.,

On motion of Mr. Jesse C. Adkins in that behalf, this cause was advanced and assigned for Monday, March 6th next.

Local Union No. 2 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers et al., Petitioners,
695 vs.
Kinloch Telephone Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. J. S. Easby-Smith in behalf of Mr. John P. Leahy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Bruce A. Campbell and Mr. Edward C. Kramer for the respondent.

Rhode Island Hospital Trust Company, Administrator, etc., et al., Petitioners,
688 vs.
Kate Atwood et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Clarence Wilson in behalf of Mr. William R. Tillinghast, Mr. Herbert Barry, Mr. Walter P. Angell, and Mr. Eugene A. Kingman for the petitioners, and by Mr. Lyman R. Clark and Mr. Herbert Parsons for the respondents.

J. Dan Blackistone, Plaintiff in Error,
420 vs.
Leonard W. Groomes.

The motion to dismiss the writ of error in this cause was submitted by Mr. Joseph D. Sullivan for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
313 vs.
Wesley L. Sischo.

The motion for leave to file brief herein as amicus curiae was submitted by Mr. Vernon S. Jones in behalf of Mr. Cletus Keating for John Reed.

Walker D. Hines, Director General of Railroads, et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
240 vs.
Fred Mauldin.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to reverse the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause, has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Woodrow Parker Company et al., Petitioners,
666 vs.
Amos S. Horschberger, by his next friends, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Thomas H. Tracy, Mr. E. J. Marshall, and Mr. Harold W. Fraser for the petitioners, and by Mr. Charles A. Calder for the respondent.

Sarah Schauffele, as Administratrix, etc., Petitioner,
692 vs.
John Barton Payne, Director General of Railroads, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Thomas J. O'Neill for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles E. Miller for the respondent.

Union Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner,
693 vs.
Elizabeth Mabel Perrin, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Henry W. Clark, Mr. H. H. Loomis, and Mr. George H. Smith for the petitioner.

Gans Steamship Line, Petitioner,
701 vs.
Isles Steamshipping Company, Limited.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John W. Griffin for the petitioner, and by Mr. John M. Woolsey for the respondent.

Gans Steamship Line, Petitioner,
702 vs.
George H. Arnot, Master and Claimant, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Clarence Bishop Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. John M. Woolsey for the respondents.

The State of Minnesota, Complainant,
11, Original. vs.
The State of Wisconsin.

The motion for final decree herein was submitted by Mr. A. A. McLaughlin in that behalf.

United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, etc., Petitioner,
526 vs.
Roger B. Wood, Trustee, etc.,

On motion of Mr. Jesse C. Adkins in that behalf, this cause was advanced and assigned for Monday, March 6th next.

Local Union No. 2 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers et al., Petitioners,
695 vs.
Kinloch Telephone Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. J. S. Easby-Smith in behalf of Mr. John P. Leahy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Bruce A. Campbell and Mr. Edward C. Kramer for the respondent.

Rhode Island Hospital Trust Company, Administrator, etc., et al., Petitioners,
688 vs.
Kate Atwood et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Clarence Wilson in behalf of Mr. William R. Tillinghast, Mr. Herbert Barry, Mr. Walter F. Angell, and Mr. Eugene A. Kingman for the petitioners, and by Mr. Lyman R. Clark and Mr. Herbert Parsons for the respondents.

J. Dan Blackistone, Plaintiff in Error,
420 vs.
Leonard W. Groomes.

The motion to dismiss the writ of error in this cause was submitted by Mr. Joseph D. Sullivan for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
313 vs.
Wesley L. Sischo.

The motion for leave to file brief herein as amicus curiae was submitted by Mr. Vernon S. Jones in behalf of Mr. Cletus Keating for John Reed.

Walker D. Hines, Director General of Railroads, et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
240 vs.
Fred Mauldin.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to reverse the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause, has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Woodrow Parker Company et al., Petitioners, 666 vs. Amos S. Herschberger, by his next friends, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Thomas H. Tracy, Mr. E. J. Marshall, and Mr. Harold W. Fraser for the petitioners, and by Mr. Charles A. Selders for the respondent.

Sarah Schauffele, as Administratrix, etc., Petitioner, 692 vs. John Barton Payne, Director General of Railroads, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Thomas J. O'Neill for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles E. Miller for the respondent.

Union Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner, 693 vs. Elizabeth Mabel Perrin, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Henry W. Clark, Mr. H. H. Loomis, and Mr. George H. Smith for the petitioner.

Gans Steamship Line, Petitioner, 701 vs. Isles Steamshipping Company, Limited.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John W. Griffin for the petitioner, and by Mr. John M. Woolsey for the respondent.

Gans Steamship Line, Petitioner, 702 vs. George H. Arnot, Master and Claimant, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Clarence Bishop Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. John M. Woolsey for the respondents.

Central of Georgia Railway Company,
Petitioner,

719 vs.

M. J. Newberry.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William M. Williams and Mr. Jacob A. Walker for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, February 27th next, at 12 o'clock.

Monday, February 27th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Mahlon Pitney,
Louis D. Brandeis,
James C. McReynolds,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that Arthur E. Sutherland, Esquire, of Rochester, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Davis, it is ordered that C. William Cramer, Esquire, and E. M. Everly, Esquire, of Morgantown, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward E. Denison, it is ordered that Curtis Williams, Esquire, and Conrad Schul, Esquire, of Mt. Vernon, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander H. Semmes, it is ordered that Archworth Martin, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Atlee Pomerene, it is ordered that W. I. Kinsey, Esquire, of Steubenville, State of Ohio, Boyd B. Haddox, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, and William M. Cake, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred P. Thom, it is ordered that Daniel M. Beach, Esquire, of Rochester, State of NewYork, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Moorefield Storey, it is ordered that John C. Egan, Esquire, of Topeka, State of Kansas, and Harold S. Davis, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Townsend, it is ordered that Walter E. Oxtoby, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John H. Lucas, it is ordered that J. Walter Farrar, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Frear, it is ordered that Alexander Wiley, Esquire, of Chippewa Falls, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Reed, it is ordered that Major J. Lilly, Esquire, of Moberly, and Don C. Carter, Esquire, of Sturgeon, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E. Alter, it is ordered that David E. Mitchell, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence P. Moser, it is ordered that Charles L. Pierce, Esquire, and Albert L. Shepard, Esquire, of Rochester, State of New York, be admitted to practice

as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William N. Vaile, it is ordered that Hamlet J. Barry, Esquire, and George C. Manly, Esquire, of Denver, and William B. Gobin, Esquire, of Rocky Ford, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Sutherland, it is ordered that F. E. Allison, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John F. McCarron, it is ordered that John T. Clarkson, Esquire, of Albia, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Fred Leach, doing business as
Organo Product Company,
Appellant,
105 vs.
William B. Carlile, Postmaster.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Holmes,
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Gertrude Crane, as Administratrix,
etc., of George W. Sauer, deceased,
Plaintiff in Error,
107 vs.

Louis H. Hahlo, George P. Nicholson, and
Jacob A. Cantor, as and constituting The
Board of Revision of Assessments of the
City of New York, et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court, Appellate Division, First Judicial Department, of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court, Appellate Division, First Judicial Department, of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

First National Bank of Jasper,
Florida, Petitioner,
73 vs.
State Bank of Rome, Georgia.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

First National Bank of Jasper,
Florida, Petitioner,
74 vs.
The First National Bank of Rome,
Georgia.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by

this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Bank of Jasper, Petitioner, vs. First National Bank of Rome, Georgia. 76

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Bank of Jasper, Petitioner, vs. The State Bank of Rome, Georgia. 77

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Charles F. Wood and John L. Moyer, Trading as the Philadelphia Steam Heating Company, Appellants, vs. The United States. 100

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Keokuk & Hamilton Bridge Company,
Appellant,
130 vs.
Fred Salm, Jr., et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Charles S. Fairchild, Appellant,
148 vs.
Charles E. Hughes, as Secretary of State of the United States, and Harry M. Daugherty, as Attorney General of the United States.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Oscar Leser, Eugene H. Beer, Harry M. Benzinger et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
553 vs.
J. Mercer Garnett, Frederick W. Beck, William J. Hogan et al., etc., et al.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from

Monday, February 27th, 1922, continued.

the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Oscar Leser, Eugene H. Beer, Harry M. Benzinger et al., Plaintiffs in Error, 553 vs. J. Mercer Garnett, Frederick W. Beck, William J. Hogan et al., etc., et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Oscar Leser, Eugene H. Beer, Harry M. Benzinger et al., Plaintiffs in Error, 553 vs. J. Mercer Garnett, Frederick W. Beck, William J. Hogan et al., etc., et al.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Gertrude M. Reed, Administratrix of the Estate of Lee C. Reed, deceased, Petitioner, 78 vs. Director General of Railroads, United States Railroad Administration, operating Philadelphia & Reading Railroad.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record

from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration thereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

New Bedford Dry Dock Company,
Appellant,
131 vs.
Blake G. Purdy, Claimant of the Steamer "Jack-O-Lantern".

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The Territory of Alaska and Juneau Hardware Company, Appellants,
392 vs.
John W. Troy, Collector of Customs for the District of Alaska.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Alaska, Division No. 1.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Alaska, Division No. 1, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

John Simmons Company, Petitioner,
57 vs.

The Grier Brothers Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

William Lemke, as Attorney General of the State of North Dakota, et al., Appellants, vs. The Farmers Grain Company of Emmden, North Dakota. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

456

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of North Dakota.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Brandeis,
Mr. Justice Holmes,
Mr. Justice Clarke.

William Lemke, as Attorney General of the State of

North Dakota, et al., Appellants,
504 vs.
The Homer Farmers Elevator Company.
The Hampden Farmers Elevator Company.
Manfred Co-operative Grain Company
et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of North Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of North Dakota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Holmes,
Mr. Justice Brandeis,
Mr. Justice Clarke.

Minna Lombard Crichton, Appellant,
312 vs.
Maggie L. Wingfield.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Concurring:

Mr. Justice Pitney.

C. E. Schaff, as Receiver of the Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
91 vs.
J. C. Famechon Company.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this

Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

John Gooch, Jr., Petitioner, vs. Oregon Short Line Railroad Company. 90 — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Idaho.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Clarke,
Mr. Chief Justice Taft,
Mr. Justice McKenna.

(Mr. Justice Pitney took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Company, Appellant, vs. The United States. 96 — Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

(Mr. Justice Pitney took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

Charles L. Burrill, Treasurer and Receiver General of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts,
Plaintiff in Error,
98 vs.
Locomobile Company.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

(Mr. Justice Pitney took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

Charles L. Burrill, Treasurer and Receiver General of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts,
Plaintiff in Error,
99 vs.
Russell, Miller Milling Company.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

(Mr. Justice Pitney took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

John L. Whiting-J.J.Adams Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
113 vs.

Charles L. Burrill, Treasurer
and Receiver General of the
Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

(Mr. Justice Pitney took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

Willard N. Jones,
Plaintiff in Error,
103 vs.
The United States of America.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

(Mr.Justice Pitney took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

Robert Hawes, Plaintiff in
Error,
95 vs.
The State of Georgia.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

(Mr. Justice Pitney took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

MacArthur Brothers Company,
Appellant,
97 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Western Union Telegraph Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
259 vs.
Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The United States, Appellant,
80 vs.
Isaac T. Cook, Executor of the Estate of William Sylvester Eames, and Thomas Crane Young.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by

this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Tom J. Ferral, as Secretary of
State of the State of Arkansas, Appellant,
93 vs.
Burke Construction Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri Pacific Railroad
Company, Plaintiff in Error,
102 vs.
Clarendon Boat Car Company,
Inc.

In Error to the Court of Appeals, Second Circuit, of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals, Second Circuit, of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Petitioner,
114 vs.
M. Rice & Company and J. G.
Meldinger.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Court of Customs Appeals, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Court of Customs

Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hamilton S. Wallace, Appellant,
118 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.
The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Commissioners of Road Improvement
District No. 2 of Lafayette County, Arkansas, Petitioners, On writ of certiorari to the United
141 vs. States Circuit Court of Appeals for the
St. Louis Southwestern Railway Eighth Circuit.
Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Arkansas.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

(Mr. Justice Pitney took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

Railroad Commission of Wisconsin
et al., Appellants,
206 vs. Appeal from the District Court of the
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy United States for the Eastern District
Railroad Company. of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Wisconsin,

and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of New York and Charles D. Newton, personally and as Attorney General of the State of New York, Appellants, vs. The United States et al. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of New York.

283

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Julius F. Smietanka, as Collector of Internal Revenue of the United States for the First District of Illinois, Petitioner, vs. First Trust & Savings Bank, Trustee under the Last Will and Testament of Otto Young, deceased. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

540

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that

this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

The State of Minnesota, Complainant, vs. The State of Wisconsin. 11, Orig'l. On consideration of the motion for a final decree herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Which said decree is in the following words and figures, viz.:

The state of Minnesota having made a motion before the court for a final decree, confirming the report of the Commissioners appointed by the decree in this cause on the 11th day of October, A. D. 1920, to run, locate and designate the boundary line between the state of Minnesota and the State of Wisconsin, in and through Lower Saint Louis Bay, Upper Saint Louis Bay and the Saint Louis River, from Upper Saint Louis Bay to the falls in said river, which report is in words and figures, as follows:

"To the Honorable Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States:

We, Samuel S. Gannett, Washington, D. C.; William B. Patton, Duluth, Minn., and John G. D. Mack, Madison, Wisconsin, Commissioners appointed, under decree of the court rendered October 11th, 1920, 'to run, locate and designate the boundary line between the state of Minnesota and the state of Wisconsin, in and through Lower St. Louis Bay, Upper St. Louis Bay and the St. Louis River, from Upper St. Louis Bay to the "Falls" in the said river,' have the honor to submit the following report, with accompanying maps, which maps are marked Exhibit No. 1, entitled,

Supreme Court of the United States,
October Term, 1920.
No. 13, Original.

Tracing of Parts of Original Map of St. Louis Bay and St. Louis River, Made under Direction of Captain George G. Meade, T. E. 1861, Showing Boundary Line Between Minnesota and Wisconsin as Surveyed in Accordance with Terms of Above Decree in 1921.

and

Exhibit No. 2,
entitled
Supreme Court of the United States,
October Term, 1920.
No. 13, Original.

Map Showing Boundary Line Between Minnesota and Wisconsin Through St. Louis Bay and up St. Louis River to the Falls as Surveyed in Accordance with Terms of Above Decree in 1921.

Organization.

The Commissioners held their first meeting on October 29th, 1920, in suite 612, Palladio Building, in the City of Duluth, Minnesota, and organized by electing Samuel S. Gannett, Chairman.

Meade Chart.

In carrying out the decree of the court, that the "boundary line must be ascertained upon a consideration of the situation existing in 1846, and accurately described by the Meade Chart," the Commission made a careful study of the Meade Chart, filed as Minnesota's Exhibit No. 1, and found that the scale of said chart, 1 :32000, was too small for practical use in determining a line which could be laid out and properly monumented; and that the triangulation points of the original Meade survey, shown on the original Meade Map (the location of which was absolutely essential in transferring to the ground points determined on the map), were omitted from the chart.

Meade Map.

An attempt was then made to use the photographic copies of the original Meade map, being Wisconsin's Exhibits Nos. 46C and 46D, but it was found that the process of production had caused unequal shrinkage in the several sheets composing the map, and that no accurate scalings could be made therefrom.

Under instructions of the Commission, Mr. S. S. Gannett went to the office of the U. S. Lake Survey, in the City of Detroit, Michigan, the repository of the original Meade map, and under his personal supervision, caused an accurate tracing to be made of so much of the said Meade map, and the soundings and triangulation points shown thereon, as pertains to the case under consideration. An accurate copy of this tracing, showing in addition the boundary line, as fixed on said map by the Commission, is filed herewith as Exhibit No. 1.

Triangulation Points.

The triangulation points, heretofore noted as being platted on the original Meade map by triangles, and shown in red ink on the aforesaid tracing, are located, in the records of the Lake Survey, by rectangular coordinates referred to the primary triangulation station of the U. S. Lake Survey, known as Minnesota Point North Base, drawn in red ink on aforesaid tracing, and described hereinafter in detail under the heading, "Descriptions and Geographic Positions of Triangulation and Reference Points." Commissioner Gannett secured an accurate copy of said coordinates from the official records of the U. S. Lake Survey, and they are correctly given in Table No. 1, attached to this report.

The original Meade triangulation points have not been in existence for some years, but the Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army, in later surveys of the St. Louis Bays and River, has established new triangulation points and referred the same by rectangular coordinates to aforesaid "Minnesota Point North Base." An accurate copy of the official coordinates of these later triangulation points was also secured by Commissioner Gannett, and a true copy of same is hereto attached and marked Table No. 2.

With these coordinates, it is possible to accurately re-locate the original Meade triangulation points, or to show the new ones on the Meade map in their true positions; and the last mentioned points are thus shown on Exhibit No. 1, being marked by triangles in black ink.

Having the existing, or new, triangulation points platted in their true positions on the Meade map, it is possible to "tie in" by scale any points or lines on said map to these triangulation points, and to transfer said points or lines to the ground by similar measurements from said triangulation points.

Office Procedure.

With this information at hand, the Commission laid down on the tracing of the original Meade map, Exhibit No. 1, the boundary line between the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, in accordance with the decree of the court, namely: "From a point midway between Rice's Point and Connor's Point, through the middle of Lower St. Louis Bay, to and with the deep channel leading to Upper St. Louis Bay, and to a point therein immediately south of the southern extremity of Grassy Point, thence westward along

the most direct course, through water not less than eight feet deep eastward of Fisherman's Island, as indicated by the red trace A-B-C on Minnesota's Exhibit No. 1, approximately one mile to the deep channel and immediately west of the bar therein, thence with such channel north and west of Big Island upstream to the 'Falls.'"

The center of the pivot pier of the Inter-State Bridge was found to be the point midway between Rice's Point and Connor's Point, and was designated by the Commission as Station No. O. From this point, as a beginning, a series of straight lines was laid out to conform with the decree of the court, special care being taken to have the lines over water not less than eight feet deep as shown by the Meade map, and the angle points between said lines numbered consecutively.

From such of these angle points as were convenient, "ties" were scaled to the best situated triangulation points on the map, and by means of rectangular coordinates from each angle point on the lines between the "ties," to triangulation points, the lengths and angles of deviation of the several lines were calculated, and closed polygons formed. These polygons were then checked as to closure by the method of latitudes and departures, and any errors found were balanced so as to secure closure. By this means your Commissioners were enabled, with a close approach to accuracy, to determine the lengths and angles of deviation of the several lines composing the projected boundary line.

The lengths and angles thus determined and the "ties" to the several triangulation points, were used as preliminary field notes by the surveying party employed to "run out the boundary line and to locate same by proper monuments, courses and distances."

Boundary Line Above Fond Du Lac.

For that portion of the St. Louis River beyond Fond Du Lac, and extending to the "Falls," and which is not shown on the Meade Chart or map, the Commission established the center line of the river, as a medial line between the shore lines, as surveyed by the Commission, and designated said medial line as the boundary line.

The Survey.

As the boundary line, except in a few instances, runs over water from eight feet to over 20 feet in depth, the most convenient time for surveying it was after ice had formed to a safe thickness. The winter proved to be mild and the ice conditions unfavorable, adding greatly to the danger and difficulty of the work, and increasing the time necessary to finish it.

The surveying party was organized early in January, 1921, and the necessary equipment was rented or purchased. Starting at Station O, heretofore described, the approximate position of the boundary line was laid out on the ice, in the bay and river, from the preliminary field notes, and the "ties" to the triangulation points, measured. Such discrepancies, due to the curvature of the earth, or to errors in scaling from the map, as were shown by measuring the "ties," were allowed for and distributed in the angles and distances of all the lines back to the preceding "tie." If any important discrepancy was discovered, the lines involved were re-run before any adjustments were made. From the final field notes of the adjusted survey, a description of the boundary line by courses and distances was obtained, and is incorporated herein. This work was completed March 19, 1921.

Detailed Description of Boundary Line.

The description of the boundary line, as determined, is as follows:

Beginning at Station O, being the center of the pivot pier of the Inter-State Bridge, and being the point midway between Rice's

Point and Gunner's Point; thence S. 87° 44' 47" W. 4,038.18 feet to Station No. 1, from which triangulation point D. M. & N. bears S. 74° 28' 23" W. 3,876.88 feet; thence from Station No. 1 S. 58° 24' 24" W. 6,452.20 feet to Station No. 2, from which triangulation point D. M. & N. bears N. 36° 56' 09" E. 2,930.03 feet; thence from Station No. 2, S. 37° 26' 20" W. 2,224.13 feet to Station No. 3; thence S. 0° 02' 13" E. 2,377.86 feet, to Station No. 4, which is triangulation point No. 104 A, being the center of the pivot pier of the Northern Pacific Railway Company's Grassy Point bridge; thence S. 24° 15' 16" E. 1,219.18 feet to Station No. 5; thence S. 20° 50' 20" W. 3,568.47 feet to Station No. 6, from which triangulation point No. 77 bears S. 89° 46' 32" E. 431.56 feet; thence from Station No. 6 S. 59° 10' 30" W. 639.96 feet to Station No. 7; thence N. 81° 30' 50" W. 1,490.79 feet to Station No. 8, from which Reference Point No. 1, on Carnegie Coal Company's Dock No. 2 bears, N. 53° 41' 53" W. 2,226.12 feet; thence from Station No. 8 N. 64° 15' 16" W. 2,733.26 feet intersect U. S. Harbor Line between points 52 and 54; thence N. 64° 15' 16" W. 790.96 feet to Station No. 9, from which Reference Point No. 1 bears, S. 81° 13' 57" E. 1,396.66 feet, and Reference Point No. 2 bears, N. 3° 20' 39" W. 268.87 feet, and Reference Point No. 3 bears, N. 39° 31' 26" W. 809.91 feet; thence from Station No. 9 S. 77° 23' 20" W. 543.30 feet to Station No. 10, from which Reference Point No. 3 bears, N. 32° 49' 53" E. 508.35 feet; thence from Station No. 10 S. 56° 38' 38" W. 782.01 feet intersect U. S. Harbor Line between points 52 and 54; thence S. 56° 38' 38" W. 765.92 feet to Station No. 11; thence S. 79° 02' 38" W. 1,140.13 feet to Station No. 12; thence N. 74° 53' 04" W. 1,026.12 feet to Station No. 13; thence N. 84° 03' 50" W. 41.88 feet intersect U. S. Harbor Line between points 54 and 56; thence N. 84° 03' 50" W. 894.30 feet to Station No. 14, from which triangulation point No. 134 bears, N. 7° 41' 32" W. 426.67 feet; thence from Station No. 14 S. 87° 35' 08" W. 682.19 feet to Station No. 15; thence S. 49° 41' 56" W. 718.34 feet to Station No. 16; thence S. 13° 08' 37" W. 673.87 feet intersect U. S. Harbor Line between points 54 and 56; thence S. 13° 08' 37" W. 1,164.80 feet to Station No. 17; from which triangulation point No. 6 A bears, N. 74° 51' 01" W. 1,678.80 feet and triangulation point No. 131 bears, S. 80° 24' 22" E. 1,956.63 feet; thence from Station No. 17 S. 37° 51' 17" W. 1,765.29 feet to Station No. 18; thence S. 58° 45' 04" W. 863.61 feet intersect U. S. Harbor Line between points 56 and 58; thence S. 58° 45' 04" W. 17.44 feet, to point on boundary line designated State Line Point No. 4; thence S. 58° 45' 04" W. 299.48 feet to point on boundary line designated as State Line Point No. 5; thence S. 58° 45' 04" W. 192.96 feet to point on boundary line designated as State Line Point No. 6; thence S. 58° 45' 04" W. 161.17 feet to point on boundary line designated as State Line Point No. 7; thence S. 58° 45' 04" W. 114.89 feet to Station No. 19, from which triangulation point No. 138 bears, S. 71° 11' 09" E. 1,829.09 feet; thence from Station No. 19 S. 51° 57' 36" W. 382.86 feet to Station No. 20; thence S. 34° 11' 18" W. 368.40 feet to Station No. 21; thence S. 22° 02' 07" W. 503.91 feet to Station No. 22; thence S. 7° 16' 23" W. 517.47 feet to Station No. 23; thence S. 7° 38' 14" E. 673.35 feet to Station No. 24; thence S. 23° 16' 03" E. 503.01 feet to Station No. 25, from which triangulation point No. 139 bears, S. 4° 35' 29" E. 1,372.94 feet; thence from Station No. 25 S. 52° 01' 30" E. 506.19 feet to Station No. 26; thence S. 73° 49' 28" E. 559.98 feet intersect U. S. Harbor Line between points 58 and 60; thence S. 73° 49' 28" E. 774.86 feet to Station No. 27; thence S. 80° 46' 18" E. 1,444.44 feet to Station No. 28; from which triangulation point No. 141 bears N. 51° 54' 46" E. 413.60 feet; thence from Station No. 28 S. 87° 51' 12" E. 642.96 feet to Station No. 29, from which triangulation point No. 141 bears, N. 53° 51' 26" W. 391.76 feet; thence from Station No. 29 N. 85° 55' 10" E. 734.26 feet to Station No. 30; thence S. 89° 30' 59" E. 1,042.58 feet to Station No. 31, from which triangulation point No. 142 A bears, S. 58° 09' 38" E. 1,852.35 feet; thence from Station No. 31 S. 42° 35' 25" E. 1,743.83 feet to Station No. 32; thence S. 27° 42' 42" E. 933.65 feet to Station No. 33; thence S. 4° 33' 29" E. 859.22 feet to Station No. 34, from which triangulation point No. 149 bears, S. 10° 45'

01" E. 909.08 feet; thence from Station No. 34 S. 9° 43' 37" W. 1,144.75 feet to Station No. 35; thence S. 29° 34' 26" W. 836.99 feet to Station No. 36; thence S. 45° 00' 48" W. 1,124.71 feet to Station No. 37; thence S. 73° 49' 49" W. 1,894.74 feet to Station No. 38; thence S. 55° 07' 07" W. 1,219.00 feet to Station No. 39; thence S. 41 ° 22' 10" W. 1,067.08 feet to Station No. 40, from which triangulation point No. 161 bears, S. 38° 35' 20" E. 2,553.13 feet; thence from Station No. 40 S. 28° 46' 42" W. 1,241.27 feet to Station No. 41, from which triangulation point No. 150 bears, N. 58° 36' 05" W. 492.29 feet; thence from Station No. 41 S. 43° 20' 57" W. 2,456.07 feet to Station No. 42; thence S. 24° 13' 19" W. 732.00 feet to Station No. 43; thence S. 15° 08' 18" E. 723.67 feet to Station No. 44; thence S. 20° 59' 55" E. 2,059.18 feet to Station No. 45; thence S. 3° 23' 08" E. 395.06 feet; to Station No. 46, which is the center point of the pivot pier of the Spirit Lake Transfer Railway Company's draw bridge; thence S. 18° 41' 10" W. 636.70 feet to Station No. 47; thence S. 45° 05' 51" W. 1,651.65 feet to Station No. 48, from which triangulation point No. 163 bears, N. 27° 27' 59" W. 1,460.97 feet, and triangulation point No. 164 A bears, S. 72° 09' 35" E. 1,183.30 feet; thence from Station No. 48 S. 64° 01' 47" W. 1,528.67 feet to Station No. 49; thence S. 83° 41' 53" W. 943.56 feet to Station No. 50; thence N. 58° 59' 20" W. 2,094.46 feet to Station No. 51; thence N. 86° 11' 16" W. 1,334.57 feet, to Station No. 52, from which triangulation point No. 156 bears, S. 12° 11' 32" W. 2,173.28 feet; thence from Station No. 52 S. 62° 22' 04" W. 1,083.67 feet to Station No. 53; thence S. 56° 06' 50" W. 959.88 feet to Station No. 54; thence S. 80° 37' 08" W. 1,718.48 feet to Station No. 55, from which triangulation point No. 157 bears, S. 60° 21' 24" E. 573.05 feet; thence from Station No. 55 N. 47° 27' 50" W. 2,089.27 feet to Station No. 56; thence N. 29° 58' 03" W. 1,164.22 feet to Station No. 57; thence N. 42° 07' 22" W. 1,142.21 feet to Station No. 58; thence N. 65° 03' 37" W. 351.62 feet to Station No. 59; thence S. 89° 04' 51" W. 618.28 feet to Station No. 60, from which triangulation point No. 20 A bears, N. 52° 40' 10" W. 448.82 feet; thence from Station No. 60 S. 50° 24' 25" W. 510.88 feet to Station No. 61; thence S. 27° 10' 59" W. 1,710.74 feet to Station No. 62; thence S. 45° 48' 54" W. 1,145.62 feet to Station No. 63; thence S. 61° 08' 08" W. 629.44 feet to Station No. 64; thence S. 89° 56' 22" W. 662.66 feet to Station No. 65; thence N. 42° 05' 38" W. 746.74 feet to Station No. 66; thence N. 12° 09' 34" W. 1,078.22 feet to Station No. 67, from which triangulation point No. 23 bears, S. 75° 45' 49" W. 1,173.58 feet; thence from Station No. 67 N. 8° 12' 30" W. 754.82 feet to Station No. 68; thence N. 39° 01' 32" W. 446.58 feet to Station No. 69; thence N. 60° 10' 38" W. 582.57 feet to Station No. 70; thence S. 88° 16' 12" W. 1,671.64 feet to Station No. 71; thence N. 46° 22' 13" W. 61.92 feet to point on boundary line designated as State Line Point No. 8, being Boundary Line Commission tablet cemented into top of east concrete rail of Fond Du Lac bridge; thence N. 46° 22' 19" W. 13.68 feet to center of crown of second arch from south end of said bridge, from which triangulation point No. 24 bears, N. 36° 30' 43" E. 1,327.67 feet; thence continuing from center of Fond Du Lac bridge, N. 46° 22' 13" W. 13 feet to point on boundary line designated as State Line Point No. 9, being Boundary Line Commission tablet cemented in top of west concrete rail of said bridge; thence continuing N. 46° 22' 13" W. 540.38 feet to Station No. 72; thence N. 38° 15' 28" W. 373.53 feet to Station No. 73; thence N. 25° 42' 34" W. 293.45 feet to Station No. 74; thence N. 0° 24' 55" W. 599.09 feet to Station No. 75; thence N. 8° 36' 30" E. 980.40 feet to Station No. 76; thence N. 11° 53' 34" W. 312.50 feet to Station No. 77; thence N. 25° 10' 20" W. 298.11 feet to Station No. 78; thence N. 44° 18' 42" W. 547.41 feet to Station No. 79; thence N. 70° 45' 12" W. 348.58 feet to Station No. 80; thence S. 83° 52' 50" W. 206.38 feet to Station No. 81; thence S. 56° 48' 52" W. 395.29 feet to Station No. 82; thence S. 29° 36' 12" W. 246.26 feet to Station No. 83; thence S. 5° 16' 11" E. 350.46 feet to Station No. 84, being a point in the center of St. Louis River at the "Falls," immediately opposite and 158 feet west of point on the Wisconsin shore, which point was the starting point of the Minnesota-Wisconsin boundary line to the south, run out in 1852. From said Station No. 84, Minnesota terminal monument No. 84 A bears, S. 84° 44' 24" W. 424.57 feet, and Wisconsin terminal monument

Monuments.

Most of the triangulation points established by the Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army, had been marked by iron pipes, 2 inches in diameter and 4 feet long, capped by 3½ inch bronze tablets, cemented in the top thereof, and inscribed "Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army. Do not move without authority of the United States Engineer Office, Duluth, Minn.," and also bearing the identification mark of the particular corner. With the consent of the United States Engineer's Office at Duluth, the pipes were removed, and concrete monuments constructed in their places. The bronze tablet before mentioned was reset in the top surface of the monument, and another bronze tablet 3.9/10 inches in diameter and inscribed "Minnesota-Wisconsin Boundary Line. 250 Dollars Fine for Disturbing This Point. Set in 1921 Under Orders of the Supreme Court of the United States. Reference Point No. —," was cemented into the side of the monument facing the boundary line.

The monuments weigh about two tons each. The base is constructed of concrete composed of one part cement, 2 parts sand and 4 parts crushed rock. It is four feet square at the bottom, two feet square at the top, and extends four feet below the surface of the ground. The base is surmounted by a prism. The prism is composed of 1 part cement and 1 part sand, and is 15 inches square and 2 feet high, with a rounded top, into the center of which is set the 3½ inch bronze tablet hereinbefore mentioned. The 3.9/10 inch bronze tablet of the Boundary Commission herebefore mentioned is cemented into the side of the prism facing the boundary line.

Each monument is re-inforced by using the iron pipe employed by the Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army to mark the triangulation point, and 4 iron rods one-half inch in diameter by 4 feet in length.

Each of these monuments and the reference and line points fixed by the Commission are fully described hereinafter under the heading, "Description and Geographic Positions of Triangulation and Reference Points."

Owing to the frozen condition of the ground, it was not possible to begin the construction of the monuments until the latter part of April, and the work was completed late in June.

Description and Geographic Positions of Triangulation and Reference Points.

Minnesota Point North Base (St. Louis County, Minn., U. S. Engineers, 1870; 1905.—On the low sand spit which separates Lake Superior from Superior Bay. This spit is about 6 miles long and 1/5 mile wide, and the southern end is largely covered with shrubbery and pine forest; the northern end is laid off into streets and is now built up (1921). The station is about 10 meters from the west shore of the spit and is about 1½ miles south of the Duluth ship canal. It is about 100 feet west of the car track and is just north of Twenty-fifth street. Substantial tripod and scaffold were built over the station and it was surrounded by a high board fence, forming a 30-foot square. Marked as follows: A red sandstone block one foot square on top and 3 feet long was set on end so that its top surface is about one inch below the surface of the ground. In the center of the top face of this stone is set a triangular brass plug, 0.03 foot on a side in cross section. On the end of this plug are two scratches running from two corners of the plug and intersecting near its center. The intersection of these two scratches marks the station. Over the top of the sandstone block is placed a cast-iron cap or cover. This cap is ½ inch thick and 2 feet square and is provided with a flange 6 inches wide setting down into the ground around the head of the stone, so that the top of the surface of the cap is even with the surface of the ground. In the center of the upper surface of the cover is a hub 3/16 inch high and 2 inches in diameter, in the center of which is drilled a ¼-inch hole. This hole marks the center of the station. The ground everywhere around the station is a fine sand. In 1905 the stone center mark was found to be in bad condition, due to disintegration. The following azimuths are from the station: Duluth State Normal School, chimney, 181° 39′ 18″; elevator M, smokestack, 334° 10′ 22″; Alger & Smith's sawmill, smokestack, 71° 17′ 17″.

Note—This point is identical with Minnesota Point North Base used by Captain George G. Meade in 1861, as a basis from which triangulation for his map was derived.

Triangulation and Reference Point D., M. & N., St. Louis Co., Minnesota.

On Dock No. 5, of Duluth, Missabe & Northern Railway Company, opposite end of east track at south end of dock, 60 feet above surface of St. Louis Bay.

Bronze Tablet of Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army cemented in concrete floor.

Latitude, 46° 44′ 46.713″. Longitude, 92° 07′ 51.155″.

To station—	Azimuth.	Back azimuth.	Distance, log meters.
102 C	270° 43′ 14″	90° 44′ 13″	3.236 991

Triangulation and Reference Point No. 103 A, St. Louis Co., Minnesota.

At 46th Avenue West and Oneota Street, City of Duluth, 42.6 feet N. E. to Curb Line on east side of 46th Avenue; 31.4 fee S. E. of South Curb Line of Oneota Street; 33.75 feet east of hydrant; 23.7 feet east of corner of porch of frame house.

As this point is near the center of a public street, only the base of a concrete monument could be set, the dimensions being:

2 feet square on top.

4 feet square at bottom.

4 feet deep.

Top of monument is flush with dirt paving.

The bronze tablet of Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army, on top of two inch iron pipe, 3 feet in length, was set in center of top of above described concrete monument.

Latitude, 46° 44′ 33.032″. Longitude, 92° 09′ 13.460″.

Carnegie Dock Reference Point No. 1, St. Louis Co., Minnesota.

In City of Duluth at S. W. corner of concrete dock 5 feet above main surface of dock.

7.1 feet east of iron snubbing post.

2.2 feet south of snubbing post,

3.15 feet north of south edge of dock,

12.2 feet east of west edge of dock.

Standard bronze reference tablet of the Boundary Line Commission, stamped No. 1.

Latitude, 46° 43′ 10.682″. Longitude, 92° 09′ 41.537″.

Zenith Dock Reference Point No. 2, St. Louis Co., Minnesota.

In City of Duluth, on property of Zenith Furnace Company, in center of top of concrete pier 36 inches by 52 inches, 30 inches above surface of dock.

Pier is at S. E. corner and under trestle 30 feet high, over which dinky cars travel; 48 feet west of steamer dock line. Bronze reference tablet of the Boundary Line Commission stamped No. 2.

Latitude, 46° 43′ 15.713″. Longitude, 92° 10′ 01.608″.

Zenith Dock Reference Point No. 3, St. Louis Co., Minnesota.

In center of top of concrete pier 36 inches by 49 inches rectangular; 70 inches above ground, located about East-West Senter line of dock at date, April 26th, 1921.

Pier is under southwest corner of 30-foot trestle.

Bronze reference tablet of the Boundary Line Commission, stamped No. 3.

Latitude, 46° 43′ 15.810″. Longitude, 92° 10′ 05.007″.

Triangulation and Reference Point 134, St. Louis Co., Minnesota.

Near foot of 70th Avenue West, City of Duluth, on bluff about 40 feet above river, 10 feet from edge of bluff, and 60 feet from water's edge on land owned by Mr. Granendeng.

68.2 feet S. E. from nearest corner of small frame house.

Standard Monument: In center of top is cemented bronze tablet of Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army, stamped No. 134.

In southeast side of monument facing river is cemented bronze tablet of Boundary Line Commission, stamped No. 134.

Latitude, 46° 43′ 08.771″. Longitude, 92° 11′ 11.966″.

To station—	Azimuth.	Back azimuth.	Distance, log meters.
136	19° 02′ 03″	199° 01′ 48″	3.138 179

Triangulation and Reference Point 6 A, St. Louis Co., Minnesota.

On S. E. side of Northern Pacific Railroad track (Fond Du Lac Branch) 0.5 mile N. E. of road crossing, near entrance to McDougall-Duluth Shipyard.

42.4 feet southeast of nearest rail.

Standard Monument: Foundation, 4 feet square at bottom, 4 feet deep; top of foundation, 2 feet square.

Top monument is 15 inches square, 2 feet high, rounded up on top.

In center of top is cemented bronze tablet of Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army, stamped 6 A.

In the side of monument facing river is cemented bronze tablet of Boundary Line Commission, stamped 6 A.

Latitude, 46° 42′ 46.339″. Longitude, 92° 11′ 57.996″.

To station—	Azimuth.	Back azimuth.	Distance, log meters at sea level.
134	234° 40′ 39″	54° 41′ 12″	3.078 517

Triangulation and Reference Point 139, St. Louis Co., Minnesota.

At Morgan Park on northeast edge of bluff, about 40 feet above river and facing it, 30 feet south of edge of bluff. About 300 feet north of grandstand of baseball park. Land southwest of point is cleared and is nearly level.

Standard Monument: Base, 4 feet square at bottom; 2 feet square at top.

Top Monument: 15 inches square, 2 feet high; rounded top.

In center of top of monument is cemented standard bronze tablet of Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army, stamped 139.

In north side of monument facing the river is cemented standard bronze tablet of the Boundary Line Commission, stamped 139.

Latitude, 46° 41′ 40.116″. Longitude, 92° 12′ 15.609″.

Triangulation and Reference Point No. 140 A, St. Louis Co., Minnesota.

On extreme Northeastern point of Spirit Island 50 feet S. W. of caving bluff point and 25 feet from each side of the point about 50 feet above the water and 100 feet from shore; on government land. Good view in nearly all directions.

Standard Monument: In center of top of which is cemented a bronze tablet of the Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army, stamped 140 A.

In center of north side facing the south end of Big Island is cemented standard bronze tablet of the Boundary Line Commission, stamped 140 A.

Latitude, 46° 41′ 17.762″. Longitude, 92° 11′ 16.456″.

Triangulation and Reference Point No. 150, St. Louis Co., Minnesota.

On point of land, formerly occupied by a clubhouse, but property now owned by Minnesota Steel Company.

Monument is 20 feet above the water, and 40 feet from water's edge, near top of sloping bank.

Standard Monument: In center of top is cemented bronze tablet of Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army, stamped No. 150.

In southeast side of monument facing the river is bronze tablet of the Boundary Line Commission, stamped No. 150.

Latitude, 46° 40′ 21.242″. Longitude, 92° 11′ 56.372″.

To station—	Azimuth.	Back azimuth.	Distance, log meters.
139	170° 28′ 24″	350° 28′ 10″	3.392 634
151	244° 13′ 57″	64° 14′ 37″	3.109 917

Triangulation and Reference Point No. 163, St. Louis Co., Minnesota.

On a hogback grassy ridge 0.75 miles east of terminus of street car track at New Duluth, 0.1 mile south of west end of trestle approach to double deck bridge across St. Louis River.

On backbone of ridge 70 feet slope distance above swamp and 20 feet elevation above swamp.

No buildings or trees nearby.

Standard Monument: In center of top is cemented bronze tablet of Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army, stamped No. 163.

In southeast side facing the river is cemented bronze tablet of the Boundary Line Commission, stamped No. 163.

Latitude, 46° 39′ 20.021″. Longitude, 92° 12′ 34.416″.

Triangulation and Reference Point No. 20 A, St. Louis Co., Minnesota.

On north side of Northern Pacific Railroad track, 1 mile east of Fond Du Lac depot; 174.5 feet east of center of Culvert 7-¹, 26.5 feet northwest of cross cut on the northwestern one of 12 foundation stones of water tank (now removed), 4.1 feet north of north rail.

As this point is near a railroad, no monument projecting above surface of railroad ballast could be set, so that only the standard base 2 feet square on top and 4 feet square on bottom and 4 feet deep was built.

In center of top is cemented bronze tablet of Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army, standard No. 20 A.

No tablet of Boundary Line Commission set.

Latitude, 46° 39′ 34.234″. Longitude, 92° 15′ 32.172″.

Triangulation and Reference Point No. 24, St. Louis Co., Minnesota.

At Fond Du Lac, near top of wooded bluff 800 feet west and 200 feet north of Northern Pacific Railroad depot, about 100 feet above track.

Original mark of Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army, consisting of 2-inch gas pipe, without tablet.

Standard Monument: In center of top is cemented bronze tablet of Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army, stamped 24.

In south side facing the river is cemented bronze tablet of the Boundary Line Commission, stamped No. 24.

Latitude, 46° 39′ 42.360″. Longitude, 92° 16′ 49.954″.

Minnesota Terminal Point 84 A, St. Louis Co., Minnesota.

Opposite the rapids in St. Louis River 378 feet west of gravelly shore, 270 feet west of river bank 3 feet high, 75 feet east of steep river bluff, about 100 feet high, and on the western edge of level river bottom several acres in area, opposite a perpendicular bluff 12 to 30 feet high on the Wisconsin side.

Standard Monument: In center of top is cemented bronze tablet of the Boundary Line Commission, stamped 84 A.

Latitude, 46° 39′ 59.368″. Longitude, 92° 17′ 37.077″.

Triangulation and Reference Point 102 C, Douglas County, Wisconsin.

Center of Wisconsin pivot span of Northern Pacific Railroad Bridge, 0.5 mile southwest of pivot span in Inter-State Bridge.

Point on floor of bridge temporarily marked by five (5) copper nails in 2-inch plank spiked to underside of ties.

Note—Not practicable to permanently mark this point.
Latitude, 46° 44′ 46.002″. Longitude, 92° 06′ 29.861″.

To station—	Azimuth.	Back azimuth.	Distance, log meters at sea level.
Minn. Point, North Base	240° 12′ 28″	60° 13′ 46″	3.419 116

Triangulation and Reference Point No. 77, Douglas County, Wisconsin.

On property of Gitchinadji Club near Billings Park, on top of level bluff 38 feet east of edge of bluff, and 40 feet above surface of water, 19 feet west of stone chimney at northwest corner of club house.

Good view can be obtained, north, west and south.

Standard Monument: In center of top of which is cemented bronze tablet of the Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army, stamped No. 77.

In center of west side facing St. Louis River is cemented bronze tablet of the Boundary Line Commission, stamped No. 77.

Latitude, 46° 42′ 5s.764″. Longitude, 92° 08′ 40.528″.

Triangulation and Reference Point No. 131, Douglas County, Wisconsin.

On extreme northern point of Big Island on land owned by R. B. Whiteside, on edge of sloping bluff covered with saplings. So that the view is almost entirely cut off.

It is forty feet above and 150 feet southeast of water's edge.

Standard Monument: In center of top of which is cemented a bronze tablet of the Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army, stamped 131.

In center of northwest side facing St. Louis River is cemented standard bronze tablet of the Boundary Line Commission stamped No. 131.

Latitude, 46° 42′ 38.840″. Longitude, 92° 11′ 07.044″.

Triangulation and Reference Point No. 136, Douglas County, Wisconsin.

On the northwestern side of Big Island, nearly opposite Pier C of McDougall-Duluth Shipyard, on property owned by E. P. Alexander, 42.3 feet northwest of northwest corner of house, 4.0 feet east of flag-pole, on grassy sloping bluff 30 feet above and 150 feet southeast of St. Louis River.

Standard Monument: In center of top of which is cemented bronze tablet of Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army, stamped No. 136.

In northwest side facing the river is bronze tablet of the Boundary Line Commission, stamped No. 136.

Latitude, 46° 42′ 26.589″. Longitude, 92° 11′ 33.070″.

To station—	Azimuth.	Back azimuth.	Distance, log meters.
6 A	138° 53′ 43″	318° 53′ 24″	2.905 968
134	199° 01′ 48″	19° 02′ 03″	3.138 179

Triangulation and Reference Point No. 138, Douglas County, Wisconsin.

On a bluff point on extreme western central part of Big Island, on edge of cultivated field, owned by R. B. Whiteside, nearly opposite pier A of McDougall-Duluth Shipyard, 15 feet east from edge of bluff, and 40 feet above river. No brush or timber to obstruct view north, west and south.

Standard Monument: In center of top of which is cemented bronze tablet of the Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army, stamped 138.

In center of west side facing St. Louis Pier is standard bronze tablet of the Boundary Line Commission, stamped No. 138.

Latitude, 46° 42′ 13.998″. Longitude, 92° 11′ 45.689″.

To station—	Azimuth.	Back azimuth.	Distance, log meters.
139	31° 21′ 14″	211° 20′ 52″	3.088 151

Triangulation and Reference Point No. 141, Douglas County, Wisconsin.

On extreme south end of Big Island on land owned by R. B. Whiteside, on edge of steep bluff about 40 feet above and 150 feet north of shore of river.

A growth of saplings 12 or 15 feet high cuts off view.

Standard Monument: In center of top of which is cemented bronze tablet of the Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army, stamped 141.

In center of south side facing St. Louis River is standard bronze tablet of Boundary Line Commission, stamped No. 141.

Latitude, 46° 41′ 47.160″. Longitude, 92° 11′ 27.964″.

To station—	Azimuth.	Back azimuth.	Distance, log meters.
139	77° 52′ 38″	257° 52′ 03″	3.015 119
140 A	344° 55′ 21″	164° 55′ 30″	2.973 195

Triangulation and Reference Point No. 142 A, Douglas County, Wisconsin.

On a prominent sandy point 0.5 mile southeast of south end of Big Island.

Point is partly covered with a growth of low brush, but there is a good view towards the river.

Monument is 15 feet northeast of edge of bluff, 50 feet from shore, and 25 feet above surface of water.

Standard Monument; replacing a small concrete monument of the Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army.

In center of top of monument is bronze tablet of Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army, stamped 142 A.

In center of southwest side facing St. Louis River is standard bronze tablet of the Boundary Line Commission, stamped No. 142 A.

Latitude, 46° 41′ 36.701″. Longitude, 92° 10′ 41.670″.

Triangulation and Reference Point No. 149, Douglas County, Wisconsin.

Near top of sloping steep bank of St. Louis River, at a point east, southeast of Spirit Island, there is a thick growth of brush 10 to 15 feet high, east of monument, but a good view can be obtained toward the west.

Standard Monument: In center of top of which is cemented bronze tablet of the Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army, stamped 149.

In center of west side facing St. Louis River is standard bronze tablet of the Boundary Line Commission, stamped No. 149.

Latitude, 46° 41′ 06.676″. Longitude, 92° 10′ 30.037″.

To station—	Azimuth.	Back azimuth.	Distance, log meters.
151	38° 44′ 58″	218° 44′ 34″	3.034 516

Triangulation and Reference Point No. 151, Douglas County, Wisconsin.

On property of R. B. Knox, 5 feet east of Geo. French's wire fence line, on slope about 5 feet lower than top of bluff, and 35 feet above surface of water, and 60 feet southeast of shore of St. Louis River, 60 feet northwest of tennis court. Saplings 20 feet high cut off view.

Standard Monument: In center of top of which is cemented bronze tablet of the Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army, stamped 151.

In center of northwest side facing St. Louis River is bronze tablet of the Boundary Line Commission, stamped No. 151.

Latitude, 46° 40′ 30.329″. Longitude, 92° 11′ 04.022″.

To station—	Azimuth.	Back azimuth.	Distance, log meters.
149	218° 44′ 34″	38° 44′ 58″	3.034 516
150	64° 14′ 37″	244° 13′ 57″	3.108 917

Triangulation and Reference Point No. 161, Douglas County, Wisconsin.

On a partly timbered point just south of Little Pokegama Bay. This point was "tied to" by the Transit Line of the Boundary Line Survey in February, 1921, when everything was frozen solid. In June, 1921, while the erection of monuments was in progress, it was found to be impracticable to transport necessary material for a monument to the point, as it is surrounded by a swamp on three sides and cannot be reached by road from the mainland southward.

No concrete monument was erected; the mark is a gaspipe two inches in diameter and four feet long, driven in ground flush with surface with bronze tablet of the Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army, cemented in the top of pipe.

Latitude, 46° 40′ 09.790″. Longitude, 92° 11′ 18.920″.

Triangulation and Reference Point No. 164 A, Douglas County Wisconsin.

0.5 mile south of swing draw of railroad and highway bridge; on grassy sloping bank, 295 feet southeast of shore of St. Louis River, nearly in line with piling of old dock.

Twenty-five feet down the slope from old grade of railroad, original mark of the Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army, two-inch gaspipe 4 feet long, no cap.

Standard Monument: In center of top of which is cemented bronze tablet of the Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army, stamped 164 A.

In northwest side facing the river is cemented standard bronze tablet of the Boundary Line Commission, stamped No. 164 A.

Latitude, 46° 39′ 03.654″. Longitude, 92° 12′ 08.582″.

To station—	Azimuth.	Back azimuth.	Distance, log meters.
154	75° 18′ 19″	255° 17′ 44″	3.029 267

Triangulation and Reference Point No. 154, Douglas County, Wisconsin.

Three-fourths of a mile east of a point opposite the wharf at New Duluth, on the northern edge of a flat summit covered by a growth of saplings 10 to 15 feet high.

Standard Monument: In center of top of which is cemented bronze tablet of the Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army, stamped 154.

In north side facing the river is bronze tablet of the Boundary Line Commission, stamped No. 154.

Latitude, 46° 38′ 54.864″. Longitude, 92° 12′ 57.240″.

To station—	Azimuth.	Back azimuth.	Distance, log meters.
156	82° 21′ 46″	262° 21′ 05″	3.047 370

Triangulation and Reference Point No. 156, Douglas County, Wisconsin.

One third of a mile west of a point opposite the wharf at New Duluth, on the middle point of several projecting prongs of the ridge east of Red River.

A swamp is at the ba
sides, making the appr
even in a small flat bott
Summit of ridge is
20 to 25 feet high. Poin
Standard Monument:
bronze tablet of the Cor
In north side facing
tablet of the Boundary
Latitude, 46° 38′ 50.0

Triangulation and Re

Three-fourths of a mi
New Duluth; on first b
above and 120 feet south
bluff.
Standard Monument:
bronze tablet of the Cor
In north side of monu
tablet of the Boundary
Latitude, 46° 38′ 55,1

To station—	Azimut
156	281° 43′

Triangulation and Re

Opposite Fond Du La
bridge at that place;
2 acres in area and 30 f
Point is 3 feet from e
off the view of the river.
Standard Monument:
bronze tablet of the Cor
In north side of monu

bronze tablet of the
Latitude, 46° 39′
Wisconsin Termin

On the Wisconsin
55 feet east of perpe
level river bottom sev
Standard Monume
on solid rock.
In center of top of
Boundary Line Comm
Latitude, 46° 39′ 5

Triangulation and S
M

Center of pivot sp
Rice's Point and Con
Point on the floor
is the initial point of
mission in January,
Latitude, 46° 44′ 5

To station—	Azim
North Base	240° 3

se of this ridge on the east, north and west
roach from the St. Louis River difficult
comed boat.
covered with a growth of birch saplings
at is very hard to find.
In center of top of which is cemented
ps of Engineers, U. S. Army, stamped 156.
the St. Louis River is cemented bronze
Line Commission, stamped No. 156.
61". Longitude, 92° 13′ 49.217".

ference Point No. 157, Douglas County,
Wisconsin.

ile west of a point opposite the wharf at
bluff west of mouth of Red River, 60 feet
of St. Louis River, 8 feet south of edge of

In center of top of which is cemented
ps of Engineers, U. S. Army, stamped 157.
ument facing the river is cemented bronze
Line Commission, stamped No. 157.
74". Longitude, 92° 14′ 25.008".

	Back azimuth.	Distance, log meters.
h. 06"	101° 43′ 32"	2.890 476

ference Point No. 23, Douglas County,
Wisconsin.

e, 0.5 mile below (southwest) the concrete
just west of a ravine on a bench about
eet above the river.
dge of bluff. Scattering trees partly cut

In center of top of which is cemented
ps of Engineers, U. S. Army, stamped 23.
nment facing river is cemented standard

Boundary Line Commission, stamped No. 23.
15.343". Longitude, 92° 16′ 39.750".
al Point 85 A, Douglas County, Wisconsin.

shore, opposite the rapids in St. Louis River,
ndicular rocky bluff 12 feet high and opposite
veral acres in area on the Minnesota side.
nt: The foundation is 3 feet deep, resting

f monument is cemented bronze tablet of the
nission, stamped No. 85 A.
9.958". Longitude, 92° 17′ 28.030".

tate Line Point No. 106 B. St. Louis Co.,
Minn.; Douglas Co., Wis.

pan of Interstate Bridge, midway between
nor's Point, at mouth of St. Louis Bay.
of bridge temporarily marked by five nails
line surveyed by the Boundary Line Com-
February and March, 1921.
8.568". Longitude, 92° 05′ 59.305".

	Back azimuth.	Distance, log meters at sea level.
uth. 39′ 33"	60° 40′ 29"	3.271 091

Triangulation and State Line Point
Douglas Co

Center of pivot span of Grassy
north, northeast of Grassy Point.
Point on floor of bridge tempor
plank, between double tracks.

Note—Not practicable to perman

Latitude, 46° 43′ 42.675″. Long

McDougall Duluth Shipbuilding C
Co., Minn.; Dou

Cemented in a concrete block
at southwest corner of Pier C, 6
from west edge. Bronze tablet of
stamped No. 4.
Latitude, 46° 42′ 23.734″. Lon

McDougall-Duluth Shipbuilding C
Co., Minn.; Do

Cemented in a concrete stringe
east of west edge of pier, 140 f
bronze tablet of the Boundary Li
Latitude, 46° 42′ 22.197″. Lo

McDougall-Duluth Shipbuilding
Co., Minn.; Do

Cemented in concrete stringer
west of east edge of pier; 222
bronze tablet of the Boundary
Latitude, 46° 42′ 21.206″. Lo

McDougall-Duluth Shipbuilding
Co., Minn.; D

Cemented in a concrete block
deep, on west side of Pier A 2
3 feet east from west edge of p
line Commission, stamped No.
Latitude, 46° 42′ 20.379″. L

Spirit Lake Transfer Railway
Louis Co., Minn.

Center of pivot span of doub
road tracks and lower deck is

Point occupied is marked
tracks on upper deck.

Note—Not practicable to

Latitude, 46° 39′ 24.735″.

Fond Du Lac Bridge, State
Dou

Cemented in top of east c
St. Louis River, in crown of
end, bronze tablet of the
No. 8.
Latitude, 46° 39′ 31.713″

2, continued.

104 A, St. Louis Co., Minn.;
., Wis.

Point Railroad Bridge 0.6 mile

arily marked by five nails in

nently mark this point.

gitude, 92° 08′ 35.742″.

Co., State Line Point 4. St. Louis
uglas Co., Wis.

2 feet by 4 feet by 2 feet deep
5 feet from south edge, 2.73 feet
the Boundary Line Commission,

ngitude, 92° 12′ 01.053″.

Co., State Line Point 5, St. Louis
uglas Co., Wis.

r on west side of Pier B, 10 feet
feet north of south edge of pier,
ne Commission, stamped No. 5.
ngitude, 92° 12′ 04.723″.

Co., State Line Point 6, St. Louis
uglas Co., Wis.

on east side of Pier A, 20 feet
feet north of south edge of pier;
Line Commission, stamped No. 6.
ngitude, 92° 12′ 07.087″.

Co., State Line Point 7, St. Louis
ouglas Co., Wis.

18 inches by 40 inches by 24 inches
3 feet north from southwest corner
ier, bronze tablet of the Boundary
7.
ongitude, 92° 12′ 09.062″.

Bridge, State Line Point 46, St.
; Douglas Co., Wis.

le deck bridge, upper deck has rail-
used by vehicles.

by the center one of 4 nails between

permanently mark this point.

Longitude, 92° 12′ 05.069″.

Line Point No. 8, St. Louis Co., Minn.;
glas Co., Wis.

oncrete railing of concrete bridge over
second arch span counting from south
Boundary Line Commission, stamped

Longitude, 92° 17′ 01.097″.

Fond Du Lac Bridge, State Line Point No. 9, St. Louis Co., Minn.; Douglas Co., Wis.

Cemented in top of west concrete railing of concrete bridge over St. Louis River, in crown of second arch span counting from south end, bronze tablet of the Boundary Line Commission, stamped No. 9.

Latitude, 46° 39′ 31.894″. Longitude, 92° 17′ 01.374″.

Map of Boundary Line.

The Commission has prepared, and transmits herewith as Exhibit No. 2, a map of St. Louis Bays and River on the scale of 1 :24000, showing their present conditions, improvements along the harbor front, the U. S. Government Harbor Lines and channels, and the relative position of the boundary line. There are also shown as sub-maps, on larger scale, improved or partly improved properties which are crossed by the boundary line; also detailed drawings of the concrete monuments as constructed.

Tables.

The rectangular, coordinates, referred to Minnesota Point North Base, of all monuments, reference point and line points are shown in Tables Nos. 2, 4 and 5, hereto attached.

The geographic position of the angle points in the boundary line are shown in Table No. 6.

Instruments.

The instrument used in making the survey was a Transit Theodolite with 6½-inch circle and reading to 10 seconds of arc. The measurements were made on the surface of the ice with a steel tape 300 feet in length, under a tension of twenty pounds, and corrected to temperature of 62° F.

Personnel.

The Commission employed as assistants the following named persons, namely:

Gordon F. Daggett, Madison, Wisconsin, Consulting Engineer.
Lyonel Ayres, Duluth, Minnesota, Consulting Engineer.
D. W. Van Vleck, Superior, Wisconsin, Consulting Engineer.
Paul Lillard, Madison, Wisconsin, Transit Man, in charge of field party.
Edwin O. Anderson, Duluth, Minn., Chairman.
Frank Kieserling, Duluth, Minn., Chainman.
Frank Suech, Jr., Duluth, Minn., Rodman.
Robert Case, Duluth, Minn., Rodman.
Robert Sansted, Duluth, Minn., Rodman.
Ray Mapp, Duluth, Minn., Draughtsman.
Eusebe J. Blais, Duluth, Minn., Draughtsman.

Finances.

We return herewith a financial statement showing in detail the money actually expended in carrying out the terms of the decree of the court.

Record Books.

All field, computation and record books have been placed in the custody of the chairman of the Commission, and filed by him in the office of the Geological Survey, Interior Department, Washington, D. C.

Respectfully submitted,

SAMUEL S. GANNETT,
WILLIAM B. PATTON,
JOHN G. D. MACK,
Commissioners.

June 25th, 1921.

The cause coming on to be heard upon said motion of the said State of Minnesota.

It is hereby ordered, adjudged and decreed, that said report of said Commission, filed in the office of the clerk of this court on August 5, 1921, is in all respects confirmed.

It is further ordered, adjudged and decreed that the line as delineated and set forth in said report and upon the two maps accompanying said report being marked respectively Exhibits 1 and 2 by said Commission and which line has been marked by permanent monuments as stated in said report, be and the same is hereby established, declared and decreed to be the true boundary line between the states of Minnesota and Wisconsin and said maps so marked as aforesaid as Exhibits 1 and 2 are directed to be filed as a part of this decree and it appearing that the expenses and compensation of the Commissioners attendant upon the discharge of their duties amounts to fifteen thousand six hundred twenty-six dollars and six cents ($15,626.06), it is ordered that the same be allowed and approved as a part of the costs of this suit, to be borne equally by the parties. And that the sum of two thousand five hundred sixty dollars ($2,560), the expense of printing the record in this case, and the sum of two hundred thirty ($230) dollars, the expense of printing the report of the Commissioners in this case, amounting in the aggregate to two thousand seven hundred ninety dollars ($2,790), are allowed and approved as a part of the costs of this suit to be borne equally by the parties and if one of them has paid more than one-half of such sums, it shall be reimbursed by the other for such excess.

It is further ordered, that the clerk of this court do transmit to the respective governors of the states of Minnesota and Wisconsin copies of this decree, duly authenticated under the seal of this court, omitting from said copies the two maps filed with the report.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
313 vs.
Wesley L. Sischo.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file brief of Cletus Keating on behalf of John Reed, as amicus curiae, in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
313 vs.
Wesley L. Sischo.

On consideration of the motion of Cletus Keating for leave to make oral argument herein on behalf of John Reed, as amicus curiae,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Woodrow-Parker Company et al., Petitioners,
666 vs.
Amos S. Herschberger, by his next friend, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Rhode Island Hospital Trust Company, Administrator, etc., et al., Petitioners,
688 vs.
Kate Atwood et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sarah Schauffele, as Administratrix, etc., Petitioner,
692 vs.
John Barton Payne, Director General of Railroads, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Union Pacific Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
693 vs.
Elizabeth Mabel Perrin, Administratrix, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Utah.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Utah, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Local Union No. 2 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers et al.,
Petitioners,
695 vs.
Kinloch Telephone Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gans Steamship Line, Petitioner, vs. Isles Steamshipping Company, Limited. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

701

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gans Steamship Line, Petitioner, vs. George H. Arnot, Master & Claimant of the British Steamship "Frankmere" et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

702

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Central of Georgia Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. M. J. Newberry. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

719

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Continental Insurance Company and Fidelity-Phenix Fire Insurance Company of New York, Appellants, vs. The United States of America et al. and Seward Prosser, Mortimer N. Buckner, et al., etc., Appellants,

609

610 vs.
The United States of America
et al.

ORDERED that these cases be restored to the docket and set for argument as the first cases for hearing April 10th next, on the question whether the decree in the District Court, from which these are appeals, is in conformity with the opinion of this Court in United States v. Reading Company, 253 U. S. 26, and that the Attorney General be advised of this order.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pueblo of Laguna, Appellant, Appeal from the District Court of the United
75 vs. States for the District of New Mexico.
Jose Candelaria et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Mexico, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

P. H. Harris, Appellant, Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of
112 vs. Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.
The United States of America.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri Pacific Railroad In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of
Company, Plaintiff in Error, Arkansas.
115 vs.
Izard County Highway Improvement District No. 1.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from

the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gustavus French Harvey and
Eleanor Harvey, His Wife,
Appellants,
125 vs.
The Union Traction Company,
J. D. Siggins, President.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. Dan Blackistone, Plaintiff in Error,
420 vs.
Leonard W. Groomes.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John A. Grogan, Collector, etc.,
Appellant,
615 vs.
Hiram Walker & Sons, Ltd.;
and
The Anchor Line (Henderson Brothers),
Ltd., Appellant,

639 vs.
George W. Aldridge, Collector of Customs for the Port of New York.

The motion to advance these causes was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf.

Interstate Commerce Commission,
Plaintiff in Error,
684 vs.
The United States of America ex rel. Members of the Waste Merchants' Association of New York, voluntary association.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf.

The United States of America ex rel. John W. French,
Plaintiff in Error,
724 vs.
John W. Weeks, Secretary of War; and

The United States of America ex rel. William F. Creary,
Plaintiff in Error,
725 vs.
John W. Weeks, Secretary of War.

The motion to advance these causes was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
698 vs.
Various Documents, Papers, and Books, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. William C. Herron for the petitioner, and by Mr. William Burry and Mr. Albert L. Hopkins for the respondents.

Justus S. Wardell, as Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.,
Petitioner,
705 vs.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. C. Noble Jones for the petitioner, and by

for the respondents.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner,
715 vs.
D. A. Winslow et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. W. H. Fuller, Mr. Adrien F. Busick, and Mr. Charles S. Moore for the petitioners.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner,
716 vs.
Norden Ship Supply Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. W. H. Fuller, Mr. Adrien F. Busick, and Mr. Charles S. Moore for the petitioner.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
723 vs.
James A. Baker, Receiver, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the petitioner.

American Steel Foundries,
Petitioner,
2 vs.
The Tri-City Central Trades Council et al.

The motion to retax costs was submitted by Mr. John A. Reed in behalf of counsel.

Borough of Edgewood, Plaintiff in Error,
152 vs.
Wilkinsburg & East Pittsburgh Street Railway Company et al.; and
Borough of Edgewood, Plaintiff in Error,
266 vs.
The Public Servide Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania et al.

The motion for leave to file brief herein on behalf of Scranton Street Railway Company as amicus curiae was submitted by Mr. H. B. Gill in that behalf.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al.,
Appellants,
752 vs.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., Appellants,
753 vs.
Northern Union Gas Company.

The motion to advance these causes was submitted by Mr. C. A. Vilas in that behalf.

The Dayton Brass Castings Company, Petitioner,
738 vs.
A. C. Gilligan, U. S. Collector, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Lawrence Maxwell and Mr. J. Sprigg McMahon for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Ottinger and Mr. Charles H. Weston for the respondent.

Ex parte in the matter of James E. Cantrill et al., Petitioners.
--- Original.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted by Mr. Chapin Brown and Mr. Raymond M. Hudson for the petitioners.

The Bank of America, Plaintiff in Error,
617 vs.
Whitney Central National Bank.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. John A. Kratz in that behalf.

C. E. Schaff, Receiver, etc., Appellant,
264 vs.
The United States; and
The United States, Appellant,
265 vs.
C. E. Schaff, Receiver, etc.

The motion to remand these causes to the Court of Claims for further findings was submitted by Mr. F. Carter Pope in behalf of counsel.

Ex parte in the matter of James J. O'Brien, Petitioner.
---, Original.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus or a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. James J. O'Brien for the petitioner.

R. W. Bratton et al.,

675 vs.
William C. Chandler et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. M. M. Neill, Mr. F. M. Thompson, and Mr. Nathan William MacChesney in that behalf.

Ex parte In the matter of Harley-Davidson Motor Company et al., Petitioners.
--- Original.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted by Mr. Melville Church, Mr. William S. Hodges, and Mr. Edwin B. H. Tower, Jr., for the petitioners.

Takuji Yamashita et al., Petitioners,
545 vs.
J. Grant Hinkle as Secretary of State of the State of Washington.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt in that behalf.

Western Union Telegraph Company, Petitioner,
760 vs.
Laura Hale, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Clarence R. Wilson in behalf of Mr. Joseph L. Egan, Mr. Francis Raymond Stark, and Mr. John E. Hartridge for the petitioner.

Ex parte In the matter of Link-Belt Company, Petitioner,
--- Original.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted by Mr. Henry S. Robbins and Mr. Morris M. Townley for the petitioner.

Utah Consolidated Mining Company, Petitioner,
729,730,731 and 732. vs.
Utah Apex Mining Company.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein were submitted by Mr. George Sutherland, Mr. John P. Gray, and Mr. A. C. Ellis, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. A. Marshall and Mr. William E. Colby for the respondent.

Charles L. Craig, Petitioner,
743 vs.
Thomas D. McCarthy, U. S. Marshal, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein, or, in the alternative, a rule to show cause by way of mandamus, was submitted by Mr. George Sutherland, Mr. John P. O'Brien, and Mr. Edmund L. Mooney for the petitioner, with leave to counsel for the respondent to file brief in opposition.

Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California,
Petitioner,
224 vs.
John Barton Payne, as Agent, etc.

On motion of Mr. Charles H. Bates in that behalf, James C. Davis, as Agent, etc., was substituted as the party respondent herein.

H. H. Bohning, Plaintiff in Error,
561 vs.
The State of Ohio; and
Emil Pohl, Plaintiff in Error,
562 vs.
The State of Ohio.

The motion to advance these causes was submitted by Mr. Frank Davis in that behalf.

Sonneborn Brothers, etc.,
Appellants,
191 vs.
C. M. Cureton, Attorney General, etc., et al.

The motion that Walter A. Keeling, Attorney General, and Lon A. Smith, Comptroller of Public Accounts of the State of Texas, be substituted as parties appellees herein, was submitted by Mr. George H. Lamar in that behalf.

Harold D. Boehm, as Administrator, etc.,
Petitioner,
721 vs.
Lehigh Valley Transportation Company, Owner of the Steam Tug "Mahoney".

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Lewis H. Fisher for the petitioner, and by Mr. D. Roger Englar for the respondent.

George Washington Pace, Appellant,
424 vs.
Fred C. Zerbst, Warden of the United States Penitentiary at Atlanta, Georgia.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Irving National Bank, Petitioner,
673 vs.
American Steel Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John Larkin for the petitioner, and by Mr. John M. Perry for the respondent.

John G. Kenedy et al., Petitioners,
689 vs.
The State of Texas et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Gordon Boone for the petitioner, and by Mr. R. L. Ball and Mr. A. W. Seeligson for the respondents.

Durham Public Service Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
699 vs.
The City of Durham.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. James S. Manning for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition.

Silas Williams, Trustee in Bankruptcy, etc., Petitioner,
717 vs.
H. M. Evans.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. J. B. Sizer and Mr. J. W. Thompson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Nathaniel H. Maxwell and Mr. Frank Spurlock for the respondent.

Michael Weisman, Petitioner,
720 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Ernest S. Cary for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Puget Sound Power & Light Company,
Petitioner,
722 vs.
S. B. Asia et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. James B. Howe and Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for the petitioner, and by Mr. O. B. Thorgrimson, Mr. Harold Preston, and Mr. Maurice McMicken for the respondents.

Hartford Life Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
735 vs.
Frank F. Douds et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Harry B. Arnold, Mr. James C. Jones, Mr. Frank H. Sullivan, and Mr. James C. Jones, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Smith W. Bennett for the respondent.

New York Central Railroad Company,
Petitioner,

759 vs.
Charles Pless.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Maurice C. Spratt for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hamilton Ward for the respondent.

Supreme Council, Catholic Benevolent Legion, Petitioner,
742 vs.
Mary J. Gallery.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. James C. Condon and Mr. Edward S. Connolly for the petitioner, and by Mr. Samuel C. Irving for the respondent.

Boston Towboat Company, Petitioner,
754 vs.
Darrow-Mann Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Edward E. Blodgett and Mr. Foye M. Murphy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Alexander Wheeler for the respondent.

Charles F. Adams et al., Trustees, etc., Petitioners,
755 vs.
Darrow-Mann Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Edward E. Blodgett and Mr. Foye M. Murphy for the petitioners, and by Mr. Alexander Wheeler for the respondent.

Hartford Life Insurance Company, Petitioner,
756 vs.
Robert H. Langdale.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Harry B. Arnold, Mr. James C. Jones, Mr. Frank H.Sullivan, and Mr. James C. Jones, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Smith W. Bennett for the respondent.

Samuel Singer, Petitioner,
762 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. James Mercer Davis for the petitioner, with leave to counsel for the respondent to file brief in opposition on or before Thursday next.

Roy Lucas et al., Petitioners,
763 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William H. Dickson for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Petitioner, 765 vs. Ralph Sullivan.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. J. M. Wright for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert P. Stewart for the respondent.
The Bull Insular Line, Inc., Petitioner, 766 vs. Societe Anonyme des Sucreries de Saint Jean.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John A. McMamus for the petitioner, and by Mr. Boyd B. Jones and Mr. Philip N. Jones for the respondent.
A. C. Nesbitt, Ancillary Administrator of the Estate of Walter H. Herrod, deceased, Petitioner, 771 vs. Charles H. Clark et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Henry A. Miller for the petitioner, and by Mr. John M. Freeman and Mr. W. D. Stewart for the respondents.
The Public Service Commission of the State of New York, Petitioner, 773 vs. The New York Central Railroad Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Ledyard P. Hale and Mr. Edward S. Griffin for the petitioner.
Transportes Maritimos do Estado, Claimant of S. S."Sao Vincente", Petitioner, 775 vs. Tietjen and Lang Drydock Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. F. Dudley Kohler for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. Curtis Rouse and Mr. Robert S. Erskine for the respondent.
Transportes Maritimos do Estado, Claimant of S.S. "Murmugao", Petitioner, 776 vs. Maxwell Rose, doing business, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. F. Dudley Kohler for the petitioner.
Transportes Maritimos do Estado, (in personam), Petitioner, 777 vs. Maxwell Rose, doing business, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. F. Dudley Kohler for the petitioner.

Transportes Maritimos do Estado,
as Claimant of S. S."Murmugao",
Petitioner,
778 vs.
Thomas De Simone.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. F. Dudley Kohler for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank J. Hogan for the respondent.

Transportes Maritimos do Estado,(in personam),
Petitioner,
779 vs.
Thomas De Simone.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. F. Dudley Kohler for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank J. Hogan for the respondent.

John Doe, demise of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts,
Plaintiff,
--- Original. vs.
The City of Rochester, N.Y.;
and
Commonwealth of Massachusetts,
Plaintiff,
--- Original. vs.
Eugene Van Voorhis et al., etc.

The motions of Ontario Beach Hotel & Amusement Company, Bartholomay Company, Inc., and New York Central Railroad Company, for leave to intervene, were submitted by Mr. Arthur E. Sutherland, Mr. Clarence P. Moser, and Mr. Daniel M. Beach, in support of the motions, and by Mr. Charles L. Pierce for The City of Rochester, in opposition thereto; with leave to the Attorney General of the State of New York to file opposition within two weeks.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
154 vs.
North American Oil Consolidated et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf, this case was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to the provisions of Section 9 of Rule 25.

Alexander Howat et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
154 vs.
The State of Kansas; and
Alexander Howat et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
491 vs.
The State of Kansas.

On motion of Mr. Moorfield Storey in that behalf, four hours are allowed for the argument in this case. The argument was commenced by Mr. Redmond S. Brennan for the plaintiffs in error, continued by Mr. John G. Egan for the defendant in error, and by Mr. Moorfield Storey for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, February 28th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Mahlon Pitney, Associate Justices.

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke,

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Selden P. Spencer, it is ordered that Hibbord C. Whitehill, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. Melendez King, it is ordered that Andrew Jackson, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Vincent M. Brennan, it is ordered that Henry C. Walters, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Cornelius J. Jones, it is ordered that George C. Adams, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Monte M. Lemann, it is ordered that Charles F. Borah, Esquire, of New Orleans, and Walter J. Burke, Esquire, of New Iberia, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William M. Vaile, it is ordered that Arthur C. Johnson, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Ephraim Lederer, Collector, etc., Petitioner,
137 vs.
Alexander J. Stockton, Sole Surviving Trustee, etc.

It is ordered that this case be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26.

Alexander Howat et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
164 vs.
The State of Kansas; and
Alexander Howat et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
491 vs.
The State of Kansas.

The argument in this cause was continued by Mr. Moorfield Storey, and Mr. F. Dumont Smith for the defendant in error, and was concluded by Mr. Redmond S. Brennan for the plaintiffs in error.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Complainant,
17, Original. vs.
The State of West Virginia; and
The State of Ohio, Complainant,
18, Original. vs.
The State of West Virginia.

On motion of Mr. John G. Price in that behalf, three hours were allowed for the reargument in these cases. The reargument was commenced by Mr. John W. Davis for the complainants, and continued by Mr. Fred O. Blue and Mr. George H. Hoffheimer for the defendant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, March 1st, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Mahlon Pitney, Associate Justices.

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke,

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard Yates, it is ordered that Clarence N. Boord, Esquire, of Springfield, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wells Goodykoontz, it is ordered that Arthur G. Froe, Esquire, of Welch, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, it is ordered that Henry Amerman, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter Bruce Howe, it is ordered that Keyes Winter, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph T. Dillard, it is ordered that William P. Smith, Esquire, of Lafayette, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Abo Land Company, Plaintiff in Error,
143 vs.
Roman Tenorio, Sheriff, etc.

This case was submitted by Mr. Bernard S. Rodey for the plaintiff in error, there being no appearance for the defendant in error.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Complainant,
17, Original. vs.
The State of West Virginia;
and
The State of Ohio, Complainant,
18, Original. vs.
The State of West Virginia.

The reargument in these cases was continued by Mr. George M. Hoffheimer for the defendant, and was concluded by Mr. George E. Alter for the complainant in No. 17, Original.

White Oak Transportation Company, Petitioner,
116 vs.
Boston, Cape Cod & New York Canal Company; and
Northern Coal Company, Petitioner,
124 vs.
Boston, Cape Cod & New York Canal Company.

On motion of Mr. E. E. Blodgett in that behalf, four hours were allowed for the argument in these cases. The argument was commenced by Mr. E. E. Blodgett for the petitioner in No. 116; continued by Mr. Henry E. Warner for the petitioner in No. 124; and by Mr. T. H. Mahony for the respondent, by Mr. Samuel Park for the T. A. Scott Co. (Inc.), impleaded with respondent, and was concluded by Mr. E. E. Blodgett for the petitioner in No. 116.

Union Tool Company, Petitioner,
132 vs.
Elihu C. Wilson.

The argument in this case was commenced by Mr. Frederick S. Lyon for the petitioner.

Thursday, March 2nd, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that Stephen V. Carey, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard Yates, it is ordered that C. M. Clay Buntain, Esquire, of Kankakee, and Frank O. Hanson, Esquire, of Bloomington, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James B. Flynn, it is ordered that Bernard F. Garvey, Esquire, and Michael M. Doyle, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Mason, it is ordered that Louis H. Bick, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Conrad H. Syme, it is ordered that Charles James Faulkner, Jr., Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of

this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Philip P. Campbell, it is ordered that William M. P. Bowen, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, and Ralph T. O'Neil, Esquire, of Topeka, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Astoria Marine Iron Works,
Plaintiff in Error,
376 vs.
United States Shipping Board
Emergency Fleet Corporation;

Sloan Shipyards Corporation
et al., Appellants,
508 vs.
United States Shipping Board
Emergency Fleet Corporation
et al.; and

United States Shipping Board
Emergency Fleet Corporation,
etc., Petitioner,
526 vs.
Roger B. Wood, Trustee, etc.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf, these cases were reassigned for argument on March 13, at the foot of the call.

G. D. Collins et al.,
Appellants,
150 vs.
Colonel J. D. McDonald,
Commandant, etc.

This case was submitted by Mr. George D. Collins, pro se, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the appellee.

Union Tool Company, Petitioner,
152 vs.
Elihu C. Wilson.

The argument in this case was continued by Mr. Frederick S. Lyon for the petitioner, by Mr. G. Benton Wilson for the respondent, and was concluded by Mr. Frederick S. Lyon for the petitioner.

Bank of Sturgeon,
Plaintiff in Error,

135 vs.
Stanley Palmer.

This case was argued by Mr. Don C. Carter for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear counsel for the defendant in error.

The First National Bank of Gulfport, Mississippi, Petitioner,
136 vs.
Wirt Adams, Revenue Agent, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. W. H. Watkins for the petitioner, and was submitted by Mr. J. B. Harris for the respondent.

Hump Hairpin Manufacturing Company, Plaintiff in Error,
139 vs.
Louis L. Emmerson, Secretary of State, etc.

The argument in this case was commenced by Mr. Colin C. H. Fyffe for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. Clarence E. Boord for the defendant in error.

Friday, March 3rd, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices.

Mahlon Pitney,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ambrose Kennedy, it is ordered that William W. Blodgett, Esquire, of Pawtucket, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lee S. Overman, it is ordered that W. Cleveland Davis, Esquire, and Campbell B. Fetner, Esquire, of Charlotte, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Victor Hoffman, Appellant, Appeal from the District Court of the United
151 vs. States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.
Francis P. Garvan, Alien
Property Custodian, et al.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hump Hairpin Manufacturing
Company, Plaintiff in Error,

139 vs.
Louis L. Emmerson, Secretary of State, etc.

The argument in this case was continued by Mr. Clarence H. Beord for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Colin C. H. Fyffe for the plaintiff in error.

Atchafalaya Land Company, Limited, et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
106 vs.
F. B. Williams Cypress Company, Limited.

The argument in this case was commenced by Mr. Walter J. Burke for the plaintiffs in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Morris Levinson, Appellant,
145 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

Leave was granted Mr. Blackburn Esterline to file brief herein as amicus curiae. This case was argued by Mr. John A. McManus for the appellant, and by Mr. Henry Amerman for the appellee Johnson.

Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company, Petitioner,
146 vs.
C. C. Whitnack Produce Company.

This case was argued by Mr. Wymer Dressler for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. H. Wilson for the respondent.

The Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Appellant,
147 vs.
The United States.

The argument in this case was commenced by Mr. Benjamin Carter for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until

Monday, March 6th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices.
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that H. H. Rumble, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. M. MacDowell, it is ordered that Emanuel Hertz, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph Millenson, it is ordered that Samuel Willig, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter R. McFarland, it is ordered that August C. Gutheim, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. M. W. Acheson, Jr., it is ordered that Roy C. Bostwick, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl E. Mapes, it is ordered that Julius H. Amberg, Esquire, of Grand Rapids, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander H. Semmes, it is ordered that Harry H. Semmes, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Button, it is ordered that Samuel Riker, Jr., Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl R. Chindblom, it is ordered that J. Kent Greene, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur G. Powell, it is ordered that Robert M. McConnell, Esquire, of Knoxville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., Appellants, vs. Consolidated Gas Company of New York. 257

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decrees of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same are hereby, modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court, and, as so modified, be, and the same are hereby, affirmed with costs.

(Mr. Justice Clarke concurs in the result.) Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Consolidated Gas Company of New

258 vs.
Charles D. Newton, as Attorney
General of the State of New
York, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decrees of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same are hereby, modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court, and, as so modified, be, and the same are hereby, affirmed, costs to be paid by the appellees.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

(Mr. Justice Clarke concurs in the result).

Consolidated Gas Company of New York, Appellant, 288 vs.
Charles D. Newton, as Attorney
General of the State of New
York, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

(Mr. Justice Clarke concurs in the result).

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney
General of the State of New
York, et al., Appellants, 296 vs.
New York & Queens Gas Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from

the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., Appellants, 295 vs. The Kings County Lighting Company. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The State of Texas, Complainant, 24, Original. vs. The Interstate Commerce Commission et al. IN EQUITY.

This cause came on to be heard on the bill of complaint and the motions of counsel for the defendants to dismiss the bill, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the bill of complaint in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

American Steel Foundries,
Petitioner,
2 vs.
The Tri-City Central Trades Council et al.

On consideration of the motion to re-tax costs in this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and that one-half of the costs be paid by each party.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sonneborn Brothers, etc.,
Appellants,
191 vs.
C. M. Cureton, Attorney General, etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion for the substitution of parties in this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California,
Petitioner,
224 vs.
John Barton Payne, as Agent, etc.

On consideration of the motion for the substitution of parties in this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Borough of Edgewood,
Plaintiff in Error,
152 vs.
Wilkinsburg & East Pittsburgh Street Railway Company et al.
and
Borough of Edgewood,
Plaintiff in Error,
266 vs.
The Public Service Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania et al.

On consideration of the motion of H. B. Gill for leave to file brief of the Scranton Street Railway Company as amicus curiae, and to make oral argument, herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that leave to file brief as amicus curiae be, and the same is hereby, granted; and that leave to make oral argument herein be, and the same is hereby, denied.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of
James C. Cantril et al.,
---, Orig'l. Petitioners.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

C. E. Schaff, Receiver, etc., Appellant,
264 vs.
The United States; and
The United States, Appellant,
265 vs.
C. E. Schaff, Receiver, etc.

On consideration of the motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims for further findings of fact,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of James J. O'Brien, Petitioner.
---, Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of Harley-Davidson Motor Company and Alexander Klein, Petitioners.
---, Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of Harley-Davidson Motor Company and Alexander Klein, Petitioners.
---, Original.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that cause be shown by The Honorables Joseph Buffington, Victor B. Woolley and J. Warren Davis, United States Circuit Judges, and The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, before this Court, at the City of Washington, on Monday, April 10th next, or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, why the prayer of said petition should not be granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of Link Belt Company, Petitioner.
---, Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John A. Grogan, Collector of Internal Revenue for the First District of Michigan, Appellant,

615 vs.

Hiram Walker & Sons, Limited.

and

The Anchor Line (Henderson Brothers), Limited, Appellant,

639 vs.

George W. Aldridge, Collector of Customs for the Port of New York.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, April 17th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Interstate Commerce Commission, Plaintiff in Error,

684 vs.

The United States of America ex rel. Members of the Waste Merchants Association, etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 9th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel. John W. French, Plaintiff in Error,

724 vs.

John W. Weeks, Secretary of War;

and

The United States of America ex rel. William F. Creary, Plaintiff in Error,

725 vs.

John W. Weeks, Secretary of War.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, April 17th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants,

752 vs.

Central Union Gas Company;

and

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants,

753 vs.

Northern Union Gas Company.

On consideration of the motions to advance these cases,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, March 6th, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Bank of America, Plaintiff in Error,

617 vs.

Whitney-Central National Bank.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, without prejudice to the submission of the cause on printed briefs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

R. W. Bratton et al., Appellants,

675 vs.

William C. Chandler et al., etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 9th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Takuji Yamashita et al., Petitioners,

545 vs.

J. Grant Hinkle, as Secretary of State, etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 20th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

H. H. Bohning, Plaintiff in Error,

561 vs.

The State of Ohio; and

Emil Pohl, Plaintiff in Error,

562 vs.

The State of Ohio.

On consideration of the motion to advance these causes,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the causes assigned for argument on Monday, October 9th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hartford Life Insurance Company, Petitioner, 756 vs. Frank P. Douds et al., Executors, etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hartford Life Insurance Company, Petitioner, 756 vs. Robert H. Langdale. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Transportes Maritimos do Estado, Claimant, etc., Petitioner, 775 vs. Tietjen and Lang Drydock Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Transportes Maritimos do Estado, Claimant, etc., Petitioner, 776 vs. Maxwell Rose, doing business, etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Transportes Maritimos do Estado (in personam), Petitioner,
777 vs.
Maxwell Rose, doing business, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Transportes Maritimos do Estado, as Claimant, etc., Petitioner,
778 vs.
Thomas De Simone.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Transportes Maritimos do Estado (in personam), Petitioner,
779 vs.
Thomas DeSimone.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Monday, March 6th, 1922, continued.

Charles L. Craig, Petitioner, vs. Thomas D. McCarthy, U. S. Marshal, etc. 745

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles L. Craig, Petitioner, vs. Thomas D. McCarthy, U. S. Marshal, etc. 743

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, or the alternative motion for a rule to show cause by way of mandamus, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied; and that the alternative motion for a rule to show cause by way of mandamus herein, be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Irving National Bank, Petitioner, vs. American Steel Company. 673

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John G. Kenedy et al., Petitioners, vs. The State of Texas et al. 689

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition

be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Various Documents, etc. 698 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Justus S. Wardell, as Collector, etc., Petitioners, vs. James A. Blum et al., etc. 705 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner, vs. D. A. Winslow et al. 715 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner, vs. Norden Ship Supply Company, Inc. 716 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Silas Williams, Trustee in Bankruptcy, etc., Petitioner,
717 vs.
H. M. Evans.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Michael Weisman, Petitioner,
720 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harold D. Boehm, as Administrator, etc., Petitioner,
721 vs.
Lehigh Valley Transportation Company, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Puget Sound Power & Light Company, Petitioner,
722 vs.
S. B. Asia et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court

that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. James A. Baker, Receiver, etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

723

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Utah Consolidated Mining Company, Petitioner, vs. Utah Apex Mining Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

729,730,731 & 732

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Dayton Brass Castings Company, Petitioner, vs. A. C. Gilligan, U. S. Collector, etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

738

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Central Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Charles Pless. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

739

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel

thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Supreme Council, Catholic Benevolent Legion, Petitioner, vs. Mary J. Gallery. 742

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Boston Towboat Company, Petitioner, vs. Darrow-Mann Company. 754

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles F. Adams et al., Trustees, etc., Petitioners, vs. Darrow-Mann Company. 755

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel Singer, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 762

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to

the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Roy Lucas et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 763 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Ralph Sullivan. 765 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Bull Insular Line, Inc., Petitioner, vs. Societe Anonyme des Sucreries de Saint Jean. 766 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. G. Nesbitt, Ancillary Administrator, etc., Petitioner, vs. Charles H. Clark et al. 771 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Western Union Telegraph Company,
Petitioner,
780 vs.
Laura Hale, joined by her husband, William P. Hale.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Bank of Sturgeon, Plaintiff in Error,
135 vs.
Stanley Palmer.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Abo Land Company, Plaintiff in Error,
143 vs.
Roman Tenorio, Sheriff of Torrance County, New Mexico.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the Matter of Marcellus Donald Ramsey, Petitioner.	The motion for leave to change name, and that a new certificate of admission to the bar be issued, was submitted by Mr. B. B. Pettus for the petitioner.
The State of Georgia, Complainant, 1, Original. vs. The Tennessee Copper Company et al.	The motion for leave to file stipulation to suspend progress of cause was submitted by Mr. A. G. Powell in behalf of the State of Georgia and Tennessee Copper Company.
The State of Georgia, Complainant, 1, Original. vs. The Tennessee Copper Company. Ducktown Sulphur, Copper and Iron Co., Ltd.	The motion for leave to file stipulation to suspend progress of cause was submitted by Mr. W. B. Miller in behalf of the State of Georgia and the
Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants, 750 vs. Consolidated Gas Company of New York; and Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., Appellants, 751 vs. NewYork & Queens Gas Company.	The motion to advance and take cases on printed briefs was submitted by Mr. W. W. Chambers in that behalf.
Bluefield Water Works and Improvement Company, Plaintiff in Error, 710 vs. Public Service Commission of the State of West Virginia, et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Alfred C. Fox and Mr. Joseph M. Sanders for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition.
Joaquin Ramos Ferro et al., Petitioners, 726 vs. Felix Fabian et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Jose R. F. Savage for the petitioner.

J. Ochoa y Hermano,
Petitioner,
727 vs.
Miguel, Luis, Gerardo,
Teresa, and Antonio
Martorell y Torrens.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Jose R. F. Savage for the petitioner.

Jose J. Benitez Diaz, in his own right, etc.,
Petitioner,
728 vs.
Carlota and Clementina
Gonzalez y Lugo, represented
by their Guardian ad litem,
etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Jose R. F. Savage for the petitioner, and by Mr. George B. Hayes and Mr. Frank Antonsanti for the respondents.

The Auto Acetylene Light
Company et al., Petitioners,
744 vs.
The Prest-O-Lite Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Charles A. Seiders for the petitioner, and by Mr. Keyes Winter and Mr. Howard Lewis for the respondent.

The Auto Acetylene Light
Company et al., Petitioners,
745 vs.
The Prest-O-Lite Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Charles A. Seiders for the petitioners, and by Mr. Keyes Winter and Mr. Howard Lewis for the respondent.

George E. Vandenburgh,
Petitioner,
764 vs.
Truscon Steel Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Carlos P. Griffin for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. F. Guthrie for the respondent.

The City of New York,
owner of the ferryboat
"Richmond", Petitioner,
781 vs.
New England Steamship
Company, owner of the
steamer "Boston".

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John P. O'Brien for the petitioner, and by Mr. Clarence Bishop Smith and Mr. Henry M. Hewitt for the respondent.

The United States of America,

313 vs.
Wesley L. Sischo.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf, this cause was reassigned for hearing on October 9th next.

Ernest Lipke, Appellant,
596 vs.
Ephraim Lederer, Collector, etc.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf, this cause was reassigned for hearing on March 20th next.

The Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Appellant,
147 vs.
The United States.

The argument in this cause was concluded by Mr. Benjamin Carter for the appellant, and case submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. William C. Herron for the appellee.

Prudential Insurance Company of America, Plaintiff in Error,
149 vs.
Robert T. Cheek.

This cause was argued by Mr. John H. Holliday for the plaintiff in error, and was submitted by Mr. Frederick H. Bacon for the defendant in error.

Borough of Edgewood, Plaintiff in Error,
152 vs.
Wilkinsburg & East Pittsburgh Street Railway Company et al.;
and
Borough of Edgewood, Plaintiff in Error,
266 vs.
The Public Service Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania et al.

On motion of Mr. M. W. Acheson, Jr., in that behalf, No. 266 was advanced for hearing with No.152. The argument in these causes was commenced by Mr. M. W. Acheson, Jr., for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Lambert Run Coal Company, Appellant,
153 vs.
The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company.

On motion of Mr. Blackburn Esterline in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief herein as amicus curiae, on behalf of the United States. The argument in this cause was commenced by Mr. Frank E. Harkness for the appellant and continued by Mr. A. G. Gutheim for the appellee.

Proclamation being made, the Court adjourned

Tuesday, March 7th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices.
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William N. Dykman, it is ordered that Jackson A. Dykman, Esquire, of Glen Cove, State of New York, and Edward J. Crummey, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. B. Swank, it is ordered that John H. Wright, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson, it is ordered that Isaac W. Eason, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Justin Morrill Chamberlin, it is ordered that Elmer C. Sherwood, Esquire, of NewYork City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Lambert Run Coal Company, Appellant, vs. The Baltimore & Ohio

153

The argument in this case was continued by Mr. A. C. Guthein and Mr. R. V. Fletcher for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Rush C. Butler for the appellant.

Oklahoma Natural Gas Company, Plaintiff in Error, 37 vs. The State of Oklahoma et al.	This case was argued by Mr. C. B. Ames for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Charles H. Ruth for the defendants in error.
The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, 480 vs. Frank Balint et al.	This case was argued by Mr. William C. Herron for the plaintiff in error, there being no appearance for the defendants in error.
The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, 582 vs. Morris Behrman.	This case was argued by Mr. William C. Herron for the plaintiff in error, and was submitted by Mr. Thomas C. Spelling for the defendant in error.
J. W. Bailey, Collector of Internal Revenue, et al., Appellants, 590 vs. John J. George, trading and doing business as Vivian Cotton Mills, et al.; J. W. Bailey et al., etc., Plaintiffs in Error, 657 vs. Drexel Furniture Company; and The Atherton Mills, Appellant, 16 vs. Eugene T. Johnston et al.	On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the United States, four hours were allowed for the argument of these cases. The argument was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the United States.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, March 8th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justice.
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that William Samuel Andrews, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas A. Connolly, it is ordered that Walter Holland, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. Wallace Dempsey, it is ordered that Charles Grosvenor Bond, Esquire, and Edward S. Napolis, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Lewis, it is ordered that George Stanley Harvey, Esquire, and Matthew Leo McGrath, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

J. W. Bailey, Collector of
Internal Revenue, et al.,
Appellants,
590 vs.

doing business as Vivian Cotton Mills, et al.;

J. W. Bailey et al., etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
657 vs.
Drexel Furniture Company; and
The Atherton Mills, Appellant,
16 vs.
Eugene T. Johnston et al.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the United States, by Mr. William P. Bynum for the appellees in Nos. 16 and 657, by Mr. W. C. Davis for the appellee in No. 590, by Mr. Campbell B. Fetner for the appellee in No. 590, by Mr. W. M. Hendren for the appellees in No. 16, and was concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the United States.

Charles Ponzi
631 vs.
Franklin G. Fessenden et al.

Leave was granted Mr. Solicitor General Beck to file brief herein on behalf of the United States as amicus curiae. The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. William H. Lewis for Ponzi, and continued by Mr. J. Weston Allen for Franklin G. Fessenden.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, March 9th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices.
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Reed, it is ordered that Ewing Laporte, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Edwin R. Morrisan, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Atlee Pomerene, it is ordered that Anthony B. Calvin, Esquire, of Youngstown, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rush C. Butler, it is ordered that Arthur M. Cox, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Henry Butler, it is ordered that Nathan D. Levy, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Kentucky Finance Corporation,
Plaintiff in Error,
156 vs.
Paramount Auto Exchange Corporation.

On motion of Mr. Frank S. Bright in that behalf, it is ordered that this cause be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 25.

Charles Ponzi 631 vs. Franklin G. Fessenden et al.	The argument in this case was concluded by Mr. J. Weston Allen for Fessenden et al.
Charles D. Newton, Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants, 40 vs. The Brooklyn Union Gas Company.	On motion of Mr. William N. Dykman for the appellee, it is ordered that this cause be heard with No. 671.
Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of New York, et al., Appellants, 671 vs. The Brooklyn Union Gas Company; and Charles D. Newton, Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants, 40 vs. The Brooklyn Union Gas Company.	The argument in these cases was commenced by Mr. James A. Donnelly for the appellant Lewis, District Attorney, continued by Mr. William N. Dykman for the appellee, continued by Mr. W. W. Chambers for the appellants, and concluded by Mr. William N. Dykman for the appellee.
Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., Appellants, 752 vs. Central Union Gas Company; and Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., Appellants, 753 vs. Northern Union Gas Company.	On motion of Mr. W. W. Chambers in that behalf, it is ordered that these cases be passed temporarily.
Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants, 257 vs. Consolidated Gas Company of New York.	The motion for mandate in this cause was submitted by Mr. C. A. Vilas for the appellee.

The State Industrial Commission of the State of New York, Petitioner,

625 vs.

Nordenholt Corporation et al.

This case was argued by Mr. E. Clarence Aiken for the petitioner, and by Mr. E.C. Sherwood for the respondent.

The United States of America, Petitioner,

629 vs.

Charles Walter Moreland.

On motion of Mr. George P. Barse in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to Mr. Foster Wood to appear and make oral argument for the respondent pro hac vice.

The argument was commenced by Mr. George P. Barse for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, March 10th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices.

Mahlon Pitney,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred H. Dominick, it is ordered that John F. Williams, Esquire, and P. F. Henderson, Esquire, of Aiken, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Selden P. Spencer, it is ordered that Jesse Hess, Esquire, of Trenton, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wilford Hearn, it is ordered that Charles Firestone, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. Warner Parker, itis ordered that Charles Reagh, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, it is ordered that Frank Simmons, Esquire, of Nashville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Pacific Mail Steamship Company,
Petitioner,
160 vs.
J. Lucas.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles J. Heggerty for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederick Clayton Peterson for the respondent.

Fred H. Hall, et al.,
Appellants,
162 vs.
The United States of America.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellants, Fred H. Hall et al., to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Winshill & Rosenthal,
Plaintiffs in Error,
163 vs.
The State of Louisiana.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Gustave Lemle for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. H. Garland Dupre for the defendant in error.

American Coal Mining Company,
Appellant,
165 vs.
The Special Coal & Food Commission of Indiana et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Indiana.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
629 vs.
Charles Walter Moreland.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. George P. Barse for the petitioner, by Mr. Foster Wood for the respondent (by special leave), and was concluded by Mr. F. H. Stephens for the petitioner.

The First National Bank of Aiken, Petitioner,
159 vs.
The J. L. Mott Iron Works.

This cause was argued by Mr. John F. Williams for the petitioner, and by Mr. P. F. Henderson for the respondent.

Anchor Company, Appellant,
161 vs.
The P. & M. Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Edwin B.H. Tower, Jr., for the appellant, and by Mr. Otto R. Barnett for the appellee.

Arthur J. Dahn, Petitioner,
166 vs.
John Barton Payne, Director General of Railroads of the United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Walter C. Clephane for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. A. A. McLaughlin for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, March 13th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that Walter Schaffner, Esquire, Ralph Benjamin Romaine, Esquire, and Melville J. France, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Addison T. Smith, it is ordered that Roy L. Black, Esquire, of Boise, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Max G. Cohen, it is ordered that Abraham Rosenthal, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E. Alter, it is ordered that H. S. Dumbauld, Esquire, and William A. Miller, Esquire, of Uniontown, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph T. Robinson, it is ordered that T. Nathan Hall, Esquire, of Sheridan, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this

Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James W. Carpenter, it is ordered that John M. Gibbons, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Morris Levinson, Appellant,
145 vs.
The United States of America and
S. Harry Johnson.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed, with costs to be paid by S. Harry Johnson; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna.

Atchafalaya Land Company, Limited;
Schwing Lumber & Shingle Company, Limited, and The Board of Commissioners of the Atchafalaya Basin Levee District, Plaintiffs in Error,
106 vs.
F. B. Williams Cypress Company, Limited.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the

same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The State of Texas, Appellant, vs. Eastern Texas Railroad Company. 298

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Opinion by Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The State of Texas and C. M. Cureton, Personally and as Attorney General for the State of Texas, Appellants, vs. The United States of America, Charles C. McChord et al., Constituting the Interstate Commerce Commission, et al. 563

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Alexander Howat, August Dorchy, Thomas Harvey, and Robert B. Foster, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The State of Kansas. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

154

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alexander Howat, August Dorchy, Thomas Harvey, et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The State of Kansas. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

491

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

Ex parte In the matter of Marcellus D. Ramsey.

ORDER: On consideration of the petition of Marcellus Donald Ramsey (admitted to the bar of this Court on the 29th day of January, A.D. 1920, under the name of Marcellus Donald Redlich), praying that the records of this Court be made to show the change of his name from Redlich to Ramsey, together with a certified copy of an order of the Circuit Court of Marion County, Ind., changing his name from Redlich to Ramsey, it is now here ordered by the Court that said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, and that this order be entered on the minutes of the Court and a certified copy thereof be furnished the petitioner.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Georgia,
Complainant,
1, Original. vs.
Tennessee Copper Company.

On consideration of the motions for leave to file stipulations to suspend the progress of this cause in accordance with the terms of said stipulation,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., Appellants,
750 vs.
Consolidated Gas Company of New York.

On consideration of the motions to advance these causes,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, denied, without prejudice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., Appellants,
751 vs.
New York & Queens Gas Company.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al.,
Appellants,
257 vs.
Consolidated Gas Company of New York.

On consideration of the motion that the mandate issue forthwith,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, postponed for oral presentation on Monday, March 13th.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joaquin Ramos Ferro et al.,
Petitioners,
726 vs.
Felix Fabian et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and on the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J.Ochoa y Hermano, Petitioner,
727 vs.
Miguel, Luis, Gerardo, Teresa, and Antonio Martorell y Torrens.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jose J. Benitez Diaz, in his own right, etc., Petitioner,
728 vs.
Carlota & Clementina Gonzalez y Lugo, represented by their Guardian ad litem, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George E. Vandenburgh, Petitioner,
764 vs.
Truscon Steel Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Durham Public Service Company, Plaintiff in Error,
699 vs.
The City of Durham.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Public Service Commission of the State of New York, Petitioner, vs. The New York Central Railroad Company.

773 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Auto Acetylene Light Company et al., Petitioners, vs. The Prest-O-Lite Company.

744 & 745 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The City of New York, Owner of the Ferryboat "Richmond", Petitioner, vs. New England Steamship Company, Owner of the Steamer "Boston".

781 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of New York, and Harry E. Lewis, as District Attorney of Kings County, et al., Appellants, vs. The Brooklyn Union Gas Company. 671

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles D. Newton, Attorney General of the State of New York, and Lewis Nixon, constituting The Public Service Commission of the State of New York, First District, Appellants, vs. The Brooklyn Union Gas Company. 40

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decrees of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same are hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Borough of Edgewood, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Wilkinsburg & East Pittsburgh Street Railway Company et al. 152

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the

Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Borough of Edgewood, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Public Service Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. 266

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Winshill & Rosenthal, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The State of Louisiana. 163

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Anchor Company, Appellant, vs. The P. & M. Company. 161

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be,

and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hillsboro Coal Company et al.,
Appellants,
193 vs.
Edward C. Knotts, United States District Attorney, etc., et al;
and
Herman C. Perry et al., Appellants,
194 vs.
Edward C. Knotts, United States District Attorney, etc., et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf, it is ordered that these cases be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

Leon Morel, Appellant,
299 vs.
Percy A. Baker, as Superintendent of Immigration Station.

The motion to dismiss the appeal in this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the appellee in support of the motion.

Takuji Yamashita et al.,
Petitioners,
545 vs.
J. Grant Hinkle, as Secretary of State of the State of Washington.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf, it is ordered that this case be passed, to be heard immediately after No. 4.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
809 vs.
Olaf A. Hana.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the petitioner.

Carlos C. Corbett, Plaintiff in Error,
746 vs.
The State of South Carolina.

The motion to dismiss the writ of error in this cause was submitted by Mr. Jo V. Morgan in behalf of Mr. Charles A. Douglas and Mr. Hugh H. Obear for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Cole L. Blease and Mr. W. C. Wolfe for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

The State of Connecticut,
Plaintiff in Error,
711 vs.

The motion to dismiss the writ of error in this cause was submitted by Mr. Henry J. Calnen and Mr. Walter J. Walsh for the

motion, and by Mr. Hugh M. Alcorn and Mr. Allan K. Smith for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

The United States, Appellant,
80 vs.
Isaac T. Cook, Executor, etc., et al.

Mandate in this cause was granted on motion of Mr. Charles H. Bates for the appellees.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants,
257 vs.
Consolidated Gas Company of New York.

The motion that mandate in this cause issue forthwith was submitted by Mr. Charles A. Vilas for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. James A. Donnelly for the appellants in opposition thereto.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
20, Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

The motion of The State of Arkansas for leave to intervene was submitted by Mr. Walter Holland in that behalf.

Ruth Williams, Administratrix, etc., Petitioner,
759 vs.
Southern Pacific Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Levi Cooke in behalf of Mr. Theodore A. Bell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert T. Devlin, Mr. William H. Devlin, Mr. William F. Herrin, and Mr. Henly C. Booth for the respondent.

Pratt & Young, Inc., et al., Petitioners,
709 vs.
Susquehanna Coal Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioners to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Layne & Bowler Corporation,

774 vs.
Western Well Works, Inc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Frederick S. Lyon and Mr. William K. White for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney and Mr. Charles E. Townsend for the respondents.

The United States of America, Appellant,
5 vs.
Southern Pacific Company et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellant, it is ordered that this cause be reassigned for hearing on April 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Arthur J. Dahn, Petitioner,
166 vs.
James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads for the United States.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. A. A. McLaughlin for the respondent and concluded by Mr. W. C. Clephane for the petitioner.

John S. Kendall, Administrator, etc., et al., Appellants,
157 vs.
Paul A. Ewert.

This cause was argued by Mr. Arthur Scott Thompson for the appellants, and by Mr. Paul A. Ewert for the appellee.

United Zinc & Chemical Company, Petitioner,
164 vs.
Van Britt et al.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Henry D. Ashley and Mr. William S. Gilbert for the petitioner, and by Mr. F. J. Oyler and Mr. Fred Robertson for the respondents.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner,
333 vs.
Winsted Hosiery Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner.

Tuesday, March 14th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present: -

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles L. Frailey, it is ordered that Allen MacCullen, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nelson J. Jewett, it is ordered that Hadley F. Freeman, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry C. Miller, it is ordered that Thomas A. Keogh, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Sullivan, it is ordered that S. Russell Bowen, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles G. Bond, it is ordered that Marshall Snyder, Esquire, of NewYork City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants,
257 vs.
Consolidated Gas Company of New York;
Consolidated Gas Company of New York, Appellant,
258 vs.
Charles D. Newton, Attorney General, etc., et al.; and
Consolidated Gas Company of New York, Appellant,
288 vs.
Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al.

It is ordered that the mandates in these causes be, and the same are hereby, granted.

Corona Coal Company, Appellant,
169 vs.
Southern Railway Company.

It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, continued, per stipulation.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner,
333 vs.
Winsted Hosiery Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner, by Mr. Melville J. France for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner.

Tony Vigliotti, Plaintiff in Error,
530 vs.
The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. George E. Alter for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. H. S. Dumbauld for the plaintiff in error.

Exporters of Manufacturers' Products (Inc.)
390 vs.
Butterworth-Judson Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Henry M. Ward for the Exporters of Manufacturers' Products (Inc.), and by Mr. William Wallace, Jr., for the Butterworth-Judson Company.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, March 15th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Guy D. Goff, it is ordered that John W. Eckelberry, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hoke Smith, it is ordered that Ogden Persons, Esquire, of Forsyth, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. S. Ashbaugh, it is ordered that Benjamin Ammerman, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Connecticut,
Plaintiff in Error,
711 vs.
Thomas McAuliffe.

On motion of Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Goff for the United States, leave was granted to file brief herein as amicus curiae.

The State of Connecticut,
Plaintiff in Error,
711 vs.
Thomas McAuliffe.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Allan L. Smith for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. Walter J. Walsh and Mr. Henry J. Calnen for the defendant in error, and was

Astoria Marine Iron Works,
Plaintiff in Error,
376 vs.
United States Shipping Board
Emergency Fleet Corporation;
Sloan Shipyards Corporation
et al., Appellants,
308 vs.
United States Shipping Board
Emergency Fleet Corporation
et al.; and
United States Shipping Board
Emergency Fleet Corporation,
Petitioner,
526 vs.
Roger B. Wood, Trustee in
Bankruptcy.

On motion of Mr. Stephen V. Carey in that behalf, four hours were allowed for the argument in these cases. The argument was commenced by Mr. Stephen V. Carey for the appellant in No. 308; continued by Mr. William M. Cake for the plaintiff in error in No. 376; by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Goff for the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation; and by Mr. Godfrey Goldmark for the respondent in No. 526.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, March 16th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Goff, it is ordered that Edgar R. Accetta, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Adna R. Johnson, Jr., Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Wharton Pepper, it is ordered that John McAllen Park, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George W. Dalzell, it is ordered that Frank Corday Welles, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George F. Wells, it is ordered that Francis H. Templeton, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

St. Louis Cotton Compress
Company, Plaintiff in Error,

408 vs.
The State of Arkansas.

On motion of Mr. Lucius Q. C. Lamar in that behalf, leave was granted to amend the record in this case.

Astoria Marine Iron Works,
Plaintiff in Error,
376 vs.
United States Shipping Board
Emergency Fleet Corporation;
Sloan Shipyards Corporation
et al., Appellants,
308 vs.
United States Shipping Board
Emergency Fleet Corporation;
and
United States Shipping Board
Emergency Fleet Corporation,
Petitioner,
526 vs.
Roger B. Wood, Trustee in
Bankruptcy.

The argument in these causes was continued by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Goff for the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation; by Mr. Godfrey Goldmark for the respondent in No. 526; by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt for the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, and was concluded by Mr. Stephen V. Carey for the appellant in No. 308.

The United States, Appellant,
127 vs.
Bethlehem Steel Company.

The argument in this case was commenced by Mr. Daniel L. Morris for the appellant, continued by Mr. George W. Dalzell and Mr. Clarence P. Byrnes for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Daniel L. Morris for the appellant.

The Bankers Trust Company,
Appellant,
167 vs.
The City of Raton et al.

The argument in this case was commenced by Mr. A. B. Adams for the appellant.

Friday, March 17th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John A. Kratz, it is ordered that Henry L. Brant, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Preston C. West, it is ordered that Robert B. Keenan, Esquire, of Sapulpa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter M. Chandler, it is ordered that Max L. Rosenstein, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States ex rel. Stephen E. McCullough et al. Plaintiffs in Error,
272 vs.
Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Samuel Herrick, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved

the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft .

Superior Court of Pinal County, Arizona, et al., Petitioners,
492 vs.
The State of Arizona ex rel. W. J. Galbraith, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Samuel Herrick, of counsel for the petitioners, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles H. McKee, as Executor, etc., et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
182 vs.
Inter-State Oil & Gas Company.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, it is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fred W. Smith, Plaintiff in Error,
183 vs.
Inter-State Oil & Gas Company.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, it is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in

this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Bankers Trust Company, Appellant,
167 vs.
The City of Raton et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. A. B. Adams for the appellant, and concluded by Mr. John H. Fry for the appellee.

J. M. McBride, Plaintiff in Error,
168 vs.
The State of Idaho.

This case was submitted by Mr. Patrick H. Loughran for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Roy L. Black and Mr. Albert H. Conner for the defendant in error.

Oregon-Washington Railroad & Navigation Company, Petitioner,
170 vs.
J. B. McGinn.

This cause was argued by Mr. William R. Harr for the petitioner, and cause submitted by Mr. R. L. Edmiston for the respondent.

Pierce Oil Corporation et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
172 vs.
Phoenix Refining Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Preston C. West for the plaintiffs in error. There was no appearance for the defendant in error.

Paul A. Ewert, Appellant,
173 vs.
Carrie Bluejacket, a widow, et al.; and
Carrie Bluejacket, a widow, et al., Appellants,
186 vs.
Paul A. Ewert.

These cases were argued by Mr. A. Scott Thompson for Bluejacket et al., and by Mr. Paul A. Ewert pro se.

Ng Fung Ho, otherwise known as Ung Kip, et al., Petitioners,
176 vs.
Edward White, as Commissioner, etc.

The argument in this case was commenced by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston for the petitioners.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, March 20th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Assistant to the Attorney General Willebrandt, it is ordered that John C. Hayes, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry Hertzoff, it is ordered that A. Judson Hyatt, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel Russell, it is ordered that Charles D. Miller, Esquire, of Smithtown Branch, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. Riter, it is ordered that Elmer O. Leatherwood, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chauncey Hackett, it is ordered that Minturn de S. Verdi, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ewing H. Scott, it is ordered that Harry C. Barnes, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Edgar A. Levy Leasing Company, Plaintiff in Error, — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

285 vs.

Jerome Siegel.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgmentof the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna,
Mr. Justice Van Devanter,
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

810 West End Avenue, Inc., Plaintiff in Error, — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

287 vs.

Henry H. Stern.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna,
Mr. Justice Van Devanter,
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The First National Bank of Aiken, Petitioner, — On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

159 vs.

The J. L. Mott Iron Works.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

(Mr. Justice Clarke took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

Oklahoma Natural Gas Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Oklahoma et al. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

37

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

(Mr. Justice Clarke took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

William Irwin, Appellant, vs. Vernon S. Wright, County Treasurer of Maricopa County, State of Arizona, et al. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona.

110

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court as to J. G. Montgomery, Sheriff of Maricopa County, and W. K. Bowen and C. W. Peterson (for whom Guy P. Vernon and C. S. Steward have now been substituted herein as appellees), and J. W. Bradshaw, members of the Board of Supervisors of Maricopa County, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions to enter a decree in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

William Irwin, Appellant,
110 vs.
Vernon S. Wright, County Treasurer of Maricopa County, State of Arizona, et al.

ORDERED that the part of the order of this Court heretofore entered herein January 24th, 1922, making Vernon S. Wright, present County Treasurer, Harry Pierce, present County Assessor, R. E. L. Shepherd, present County Attorney, all of Maricopa County, Arizona, parties appellees in place of Sam F. Webb, former County Treasurer, C. W. Cummins, former County Assessor, and L. M. Lamey, former County Attorney, retired from office in said County, be, and the same is, vacated, and the motion, so far as relates to the foregoing persons, is denied, but that the remainder of the order substituting Guy F. Vernon and C. T. Steward, County Supervisors of said County, as appellees herein for W. E. Bowen and C. W. Peterson, former County Supervisors of said County, stand.

ORDERED FURTHER that because this appeal as against said Sam F. Webb, C. W. Cummins and L. M. Lamey has abated on account of their retirement from office, the same is dismissed without prejudice to new suits by the appellant and those for whom he sues against their successors in office.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
20, Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

On consideration of the motion of The State of Arkansas for leave to file a petition in intervention herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Layne & Bowler Corporation,
Petitioner,
774 vs.
Western Well Works, Inc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Bluefield Water Works & Improvement Company, Plaintiff in Error,
710 vs.
Public Service Commission of the State of West Virginia, et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ruth Williams, Administratrix of the Estate of Harry Williams, deceased, Petitioner,
759 vs.
Southern Pacific Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied for lack of final judgment. Application not considered on its merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
809 vs.
Olaf A. Hana.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied, because the petition was not filed within the time prescribed by the statute.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Leon Morel, Appellant,
299 vs.
Percy A. Baker, as Superintendent of Immigration Station.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed

by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Carlos C. Corbett, Plaintiff in Error,
746 vs.
The State of South Carolina.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. H. McBride, Plaintiff in Error,
168 vs.
The State of Idaho.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced that the Court will take a recess from Monday, the 27th instant, to Monday, April 10, next.

Ephraim Lederer, Collector, etc., Petitioner,
137 vs.
Alexander J. Stockton, Sole Surviving Trustee, etc.

Victor E. Shwab, Executor, etc., Plaintiff in Error,
200 vs.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner, this case was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the defendant in error, this case was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

C. E. Schaff, Receiver of the Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Company, Appellant,
264 vs.
The United States.
and
The United States, Appellant,
265 vs.
C. E. Schaff, Receiver of the Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Company.

Appeal and Cross-Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, of counsel for The United States, and it appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss these appeals has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that these appeals be, and the same are hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of New York, et al., Appellants,
671 and 40. vs.
The Brooklyn Union Gas Company.

The motion that mandate herein issue forthwith was submitted by Mr. Edward J. Crummey, and Mr. William H. Dykman for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. Harry Hertzoff, Mr. William Schuyler Jackson, Mr. Charles E. Buchner, and Mr. John P. O'Brien for the appellants in opposition thereto.

C. D. Collins et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
499 vs.
J. J. Byrnes, Sheriff, etc.

The motion to dismiss the writ of error in this cause was submitted by Mr. John W. Preston for the defendant in error in support of the motion.

Interstate Commerce Commission,
Plaintiff in Error,
684 vs.
The United States of America ex rel. Members of the Waste Merchants Association of New York, Voluntary Association.

On motion of Mr. H. W. Barrett in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of certain railroad companies herein as amici curiae; and the motion for leave to participate in the oral argument herein was denied.

D. A. Williams et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
352 vs.
John K. Scudder et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm herein was submitted by Mr. John G. Price and Mr. Ray Martin for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Smith W. Bennett for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

American Mills Company,
Petitioner,
405 vs.
American Surety Company of New York.

The motion to advance this case was submitted by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt for the respondent.

John Barton Payne, Director General of Railroads, as Agent, Plaintiff in Error,
749 vs.
Farmers Co-operative Equity Company.

On motion of Mr. Alexander Britton in that behalf, James C. Davis, present Director General of Railroads, was substituted as the party plaintiff in error in this cause.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al.,
Appellants,
752 vs.
Central Union Gas Company;
and
Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., Appellants,
753 vs.
Northern Union Gas Company.

The motion to restore these cases to the call was submitted by Mr. C. A. Vilas, Mr. John A. Garver, and Mr. William L. Ransom for the appellees in support of the motion, and by Mr. Henry Hertzoff, Mr. William Schuyler Jackson, Mr. Charles E. Buchner, and Mr. John P. O'Brien for the appellants in opposition thereto.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., Appellants, No.--- vs. Standard Gas Light Company;

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., Appellants, No.--- vs. The New York Mutual Gas Light Company;

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., Appellants, No.--- vs. The New Amsterdam Gas Company;

and

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., Appellants, No.--- vs. The East River Gas Company of Long Island City.

The motion for an order extending time to March 28 in which to docket these cases was submitted by Mr. Harry Hertzoff, Mr. William Schuyler Jackson, Mr. Charles E. Buchner, and Mr. John P. O'Brien for the appellants in support of the motion and by Mr. Charles A. Vilas, Mr. John A. Garver, and Mr. William L. Ransom for the appellees in opposition thereto.

Doehler Die-Casting Company, National Lead Company, et al., Appellants, 192 vs. Brooklyn Union Gas Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellants to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel Schonfeld, Petitioner,
704 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Elijah N. Zoline for the petitioner.

Man-a-watse (Indian widow, etc.,) et al., Petitioners,
757 vs.
Joseph Woonscook, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William H. King for the petitioners.

Joseph Newman, Petitioner,
758 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. J. Douglas Wetmore for the petitioner and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim, and Mr. William C. Herron for the respondent.

Charles S. Winston,
Petitioner,
761 vs.
Eugene M. Hoyne et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Edwin M. Ashcraft for the petitioner and by Mr. John J. Healy, Mr. Thomas M. Hayne, Mr. John O'Connor, Mr. Toppan Gregory, Mr. Edward R. Johnston, and Mr. Angus Roy Shannon for the respondents.

Johanna Frese, Administratrix, etc., Petitioner,
769 vs.
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John G. Parkinson for the petitioner.

J. F. Hamer, Petitioner,
782 vs.
County of Gray, State of Texas.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. W. H. Kimbrough for the petitioner.

Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Company of Texas,
Petitioner,
783 vs.
Plano Milling Company and J. G. Puterbaugh.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Joseph M. Bryson, Mr. Alexander H. McKnight, and Mr. Alexander Britton for the petitioner.

Yellow Cab Company, Petitioner,
796 vs.
O. K. Earle.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Horace B. Walmsley and Mr. George T. Simpson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Moses E. Clapp for the respondent.

David A. Henkes, Petitioner,
811 vs.
J. H. McRae, Commandant of the U. S. Disciplinary Barracks at Fort Leavenworth.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John S. Maxwell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the respondent.

United Mine Workers of America et al.,
Petitioners,
29 vs.
Coronado Coal Company et al.; and
United Mine Workers of America et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
31 vs.
Coronado Coal Company et al.

It is ordered that these cases be passed temporarily.

Karl A. Hossaman, Plaintiff in Error,
184 vs.
The State of Kansas.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr: Chief Justice Taft.

Ng Fung Ho, otherwise known as Ung Kip, et al., Petitioners,
176 vs.
Edward White, as Commissioner, etc.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston for the petitioners, by Mr. William C. Herron for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston for the petitioner.

Evelyn P. Ferry, Appellant,
177 vs.
Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway Company, et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Henry L. Brant for the appellant, and case submitted by Mr. Charles H. Carey and Mr. James B. Kerr for the appellees.

Evelyn P. Ferry, Appellant,
260 vs.
Henry L. Corbett et al.

This case was submitted, without printed papers, per stipulation, to abide the decision in case No. 177.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., Appellants,
752 vs.
Central Union Gas Company;
and
Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., Appellants,
753 vs.
Northern Union Gas Company.

The motions to restore these cases to the call are granted, and the cases set for hearing on Monday, April 10 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., Appellants,
671 and 40. vs.
Brooklyn Union Gas Company.

The consideration of the motion that mandates issue forthwith in these cases is postponed until Monday, March 27 next, when it will be granted, unless petitions for a rehearing have been presented on or before Saturday, March 25, next, in which case the motion to grant the mandates will be further considered.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., Appellants,
No.--- vs.
Standard Gas Light Company;

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., Appellants,

No.--- vs.
New York Mutual Gas Light Company;

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., Appellants,
No. --- vs.
New Amsterdam Gas Company; and

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., Appellants,
No. --- vs.
East River Gas Company of Long Island City.

The motion to extend time to March 28 next within which to file appeals in these cases is granted.

Jesus M. Balzac, Appellant,
178 and 179. vs.
The People of Porto Rico.

The argument in this case was commenced by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston for the appellant, and concluded by Mr. Grant T. Trent for the appellees.

T. B. Stafford et al., copartners, etc., et al., Appellants,
687 vs.
Henry C. Wallace, etc., et al.;
and
James Eugene Burton et al., Appellants,
691 vs.
Charles F. Clyne, U. S. District Attorney for the Northern District of Illinois.

On motion of Mr. Levy Mayer in that behalf, three hours were allowed for the argument in these cases. The argument was commenced by Mr. E. G. Godman for the appellants in No. 687, and continued by Mr. Levy Mayer for the appellants in No. 691.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, March 21st, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis Van Devanter,

Mahlon Pitney,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke,

Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, it is ordered that John H. Awtry, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Wharton Pepper, it is ordered that G. Levering Arnhold, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi Cooke, it is ordered that Herman Block, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merrill Moores, it is ordered that Joseph H. Shea, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., it is ordered that Nelson B. Cramer, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
134 vs.
North American Oil Consolidated
et al.,

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, of counsel for the appellant, and it appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Galveston Wharf Company et al.,
Appellants,
189 vs.
City of Galveston et al.

This case was continued, per stipulation of counsel.

T. B. Stafford et al., copartners,
etc., et al., Appellants,
687 vs.
Henry C. Wallace, etc., et al.;
and
James Eugene Burton et al.,
Appellants,
691 vs.
Charles F. Clyne, United States
District Attorney for the Northern
District of Illinois.

The argument in these cases was continued by Mr. Levy Mayer for the appellant in No. 691, and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellees.

Ernest Lipke, Appellant,
596 vs.
Ephraim Lederer, Collector of
Internal Revenue, etc.

The argument in this case was commenced by Mr. Lincoln L. Eyre for the appellant, continued by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the appellee, and continued by Mr. Lincoln L. Eyre for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, March 22nd, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Glenn Terrell, it is ordered that James M. Carson, Esquire, of Miami, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward S. Bailey, it is ordered that Andrew S. Iddings, Esquire, of Dayton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. M. McCormick, it is ordered that E. P. Smith, Esquire, of Austin, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Levy, it is ordered that Bernard H. Feldstein, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
vs.
154
North American Oil Consolidated
et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellant, the mandate in this case was granted.

Ernest Lipke, Appellant, 596 vs. Ephraim Lederer, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.	The argument in this case was concluded by Mr. Lincoln L. Eyre for the appellant.
Jim Denson, Plaintiff in Error, 185 vs. The State of Georgia. M. Napier for the defendant in error.	This case was argued by Mr. John Randolph Cooper for the plaintiff in error, and was submitted by Mr. George
Mary Louise Greiner, Executrix, etc., Plaintiff in Error, 187 vs. C. G. Lewellyn, Collector of Internal Revenue.	The argument in this case was commenced by Mr. W. D. Stewart for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Levi Cooke for the plaintiff in error.
United Mine Workers of America et al., Petitioners, 29 vs. Coronado Coal Company et al.; and United Mine Workers of America et al., Plaintiffs in Error, 31 vs. Coronado Coal Company et al.	On motion of Mr. William A. Glasgow, Jr., for the petitioners and plaintiffs in error, three hours and forty minutes were allowed for the reargument in these cases. The reargument was commenced by Mr. William A. Glasgow, Jr., for the petitioners and plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, March 23rd, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Selden P. Spencer, it is ordered that Henry M. Wolf, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

United Mine Workers of America et al., Petitioners,
29 vs.
Coronado Coal Company et al.;
and
United Mine Workers of America et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
31 vs.
Coronado Coal Company et al.

The argument in these cases was continued by Mr. William A. Glasgow, Jr., for the petitioners and plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. Henry S. Drinker, Jr., for the respondents and defendants in error, and was concluded by Mr. J. B. McDonough for the respondents and defendants in error.

Forbes Pioneer Boat Line,
Plaintiff in Error,
188 vs.
Board of Commissioners of Everglades Drainage District.

This case was argued by Mr. James M. Carson for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. William Glenn Terrell for the defendant in error. Leave was granted counsel for plaintiff in error to file brief within five days.

British Columbia Mills Tug & Barge Company, Petitioner,
190 vs.
A. W. Mylroie.

The argument in this case was commenced by Mr. W. B. Stratton for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, March 24th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clyde C. Dawson, it is ordered that George E. Thomas, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, and Joseph Musgrove, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Meyer Cohen, it is ordered that S. Heth Tyler, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. Glanville Munson, it is ordered that William A. Rounds, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, and Clifford M. Ollivette, Esquire, of Plattsburgh, State of New York, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles C. Kearns, it is ordered that William Hannibal Thomas, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The City of Sapulpa et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error.
201 vs.
Oklahoma Natural Gas Company.

This case was submitted by Mr. James F. Lawrence for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. D. A. Richardson, Mr. C. B. Ames, and Mr. Russell C.LOwe for the defendant in error.

British Columbia Mills Tug & Barge Company, Petitioner,
190 vs.
A. W. Mylroie.

The argument in this case was continued by Mr. W. B. Stratton for the petitioner, by Mr. William H. Gorham for the respondent, and was concluded by Mr. W. B. Stratton for the petitioner.

Sonneborn Brothers, etc.,
Appellants,
191 vs.
W. A. Keeling, Attorney General, etc., et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Joseph Manson McCormick for the appellants, and by Mr. E. F. Smith for the appellees.

Carlisle Packing Company,
Petitioner,
195 vs.
Ole Sandanger.

This case was argued by Mr. J. Harry Covington for the petitioner, and case submitted by Mr. Maurice McMicken for the respondent.

Julia Lamere Mickadiet, etc., et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
198 vs.
John Barton Payne, Secretary of the Interior.

Albert B. Fall, present Secretary of the Interior, was substituted as the party defendant in error herein, on motion of Mr. Edward F. Colladay in that behalf. The case was submitted by Mr. Edward F. Colladay, Mr. Harry S. Barger, Mr. P. H. Marshall, and Mr. B. B. Pettus for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, Mr. C. Edward Wright, and Mr. Charles J. Kappler for the defendant in error, with leave to counsel for plaintiffs in error to file additional brief within five days.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, March 27th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that Terry A. Lyon, Esquire, of Fayetteville, State of North Carolina; T. Ellis Allison, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; Jules Gilmer Horner, Jr., Esquire, of Winston-Salem, State of North Carolina; John J. Marquette, Esquire, of Missoula, State of Montana; Benjamin M. Price, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania; Tom D. Binckley, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio; Benjamin Horsley Littleton, Esquire, of Nashville, State of Tennessee; and Chester A. Bennett, Esquire, of Greenup, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Donovan, it is ordered that Meyer Kraushaar, Esquire, John W. Crandall, Esquire, and George C. Sprague, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur E. Dowell, it is ordered that William E. Baldwin, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rufus S. Day,

it is ordered that Frederic D. Fuller, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Hollingsworth, it is ordered that J. A. Howell, Esquire, of Ogden, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander Britton, it is ordered that Homer W. Davis, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Hump Hairpin Manufacturing Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
139 vs.
Louis L. Emmerson, Secretary of
State of the State of Illinois.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Van Devanter.
Mr. Justice McReynolds concurs in the result.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
582 vs.
Morris Behrman.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the

same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this COurt.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes,
Mr. Justice McReynolds,
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Pacific Mail Steamship Company,
Petitioner,
160 vs.
J. Lucas.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

United Zinc and Chemical Company,
Petitioner,
164 vs.
Van Britt and Susie Britt.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Clarke,
Mr. Chief Justice Taft,

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
480 vs.
Frank Balint and Alfonso Randazzo.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

(Mr. Justice Clarke took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

Charles Ponzi
631 vs.
Franklin G. Fessenden et al.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered in the affirmative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of New York, et al.,
Appellants,
671 and 40. vs.
The Brooklyn Union Gas Company.

On consideration of the motion that the mandates in this cause issue forthwith, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Doe, etc., et al.,
Plaintiffs,
--- Original. vs.
The City of Rochester.
and
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Plaintiff,
--- Original. vs.
Eugene Van Voorhis et al.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the motions of Bartholomay Company, Inc., New York Central Railroad Company, and Ontario Beach Hotel & Amusement Company, for leave to intervene herein, be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing on the rules to show cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Mills Company,
Petitioner,
405 vs.
American Surety Company of New York.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 6th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

G. D. Collins and Frank C. Drew, Plaintiffs in Error,
499 vs.
J. J. Byrnes, the Sheriff of the County of Mendocino, State of California.

In Error to the Superior Court in and for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California.

This cause come on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court in and for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

D. A. Williams, G. Frank Malin, and Charles E. Schilling,
Plaintiffs in Error,
352 vs.
John K. Scudder, Ben R. McClelland, S. M. Sherman, et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause come on to be heard on the transcript of the record from

the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jim Denson, Plaintiff in Error, In Error to the Supreme Court of the
185 vs. State of Georgia.
The State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The City of Sapulpa et al., In Error to the Supreme Court of the
Plaintiffs in Error, State of Oklahoma.
201 vs.
Oklahoma Natural Gas Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Johanna Frese, Administratrix, On petition for writ of certiorari to
etc., Petitioner, the Supreme Court of the State of
769 vs. Missouri.
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy
Railroad Company.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel Schonfeld, Petitioner,
704 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Man-a-Watze (Indian widow), etc., et al., Petitioners,
757 vs.
Joseph Woonsook (Indian), alias Little Joe Woonsook, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Utah.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Utah, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph Newman, Petitioner,
758 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles S. Winston,
Petitioner,
761 vs.
Eugene M. Hoyne et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. F. Hamer, Petitioner, vs. County of Gray, State of Texas. 782

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Company of Texas, Petitioner, vs. Plano Milling Company et al. 783

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Yellow Cab Company, Petitioner, vs. O. K. Earle. 796

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

David A. Henkes, Petitioner, vs. J. H. McRae, Commandant of the U. S. Disciplinary Barracks at Fort Leavenworth. 811

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Associated Billposters and Distributors of the United States and Canada et al., Appellants, vs. The United States.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, of counsel for the appellee, and it appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

232 Hartford Life Insurance Company, Appellant, vs. Garland S. Johnson, Administrator, etc.

The motion for supersedeas herein was submitted by Mr. James M. Beck in behalf of counsel for the appellant.

801 Georgia Railway & Power Company et al., Appellants, vs. Railroad Commission of the State of Georgia et al.

The motion to advance herein was submitted by Mr. Luther Z. Rosser in that behalf.

832 Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., Appellants, vs. New York Mutual Gas Light Company;

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., Appellants,

--- vs.
Standard Gas Light Company;

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., Appellants,
--- vs.
The New Amsterdam Gas Company;
and
Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., Appellants,
--- vs.
The East River Gas Company of Long Island City.

The motion to advance and assign these cases for hearing on April 10 next was submitted by Mr. Charles A. Vilas for the appellees in support of the motion, and by Mr. Harry Hertzoff for the appellants in opposition thereto.

The Ogden Portland Cement Company, Plaintiff in Error,
555 vs.
Public Utilities Commission of Utah;
Union Portland Cement Company, Plaintiff in Error,
556 vs.
Public Utilities Commission of Utah;
and
Utah Idaho Central Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,
574 vs.
Public Utilities Commission of Utah.

The motion to affirm herein was submitted by Mr. Harvey H. Cluff for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. C. R. Hollingsworth for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto, with leave to counsel for the plaintiffs in error to file additional brief within one week.

Insurance Company of North America, Petitioner,
808 vs.
Harry R. Brigham et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Rufus S. Day, Mr. D. Roger Englar, and Mr. George S. Brengle for the petitioners, and by Mr. Pierre M. Brown for the respondent.

American Column & Lumber Company et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America. 71

The motion for rehearing, or, in the alternative, a modification of the decree, was submitted by Mr. G. Carroll Todd and Mr. Louis Claire Boyle for the appellants.

The Iowa State Bank, Petitioner, vs. The New Amsterdam Casualty Company. 795

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Howard J. Clark and Mr. H. W. Byers for the petitioner, and by Mr. O. M. Brockett for the respondent.

International Life Insurance Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Adrian F. Sherman. 797

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Armwell L. Cooper and Mr. Charles G. Revelle for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. John H. Atwood, Mr. Oscar S. Hill, and Mr. William Thomson for the defendant in error.

Harry Brolaski, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 802

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Philip S. Ehrlich for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Director General of Railroads, Petitioner, vs. Leah St. Dennis, as Administratrix, etc. 810

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Lyman M. Bass for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hamilton Ward for the respondent.

Sarnia Steamship Corporation, as Claimant of the American Steamship "Sarnia", Petitioner, vs. L. Telles De Vasconcellos. 818

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. George Whitefield Betts, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. D. Roger Englar and Mr. Oscar L. Houston for the respondent.

The San Joaquin & Kings River Canal & Irrigation Company (Inc.), Petitioner,
830 vs.
W. H. Worswick, Jr., et al.;
and
Miller & Lux (Inc.), et al.,
Petitioners,
831 vs.
W. H. Worswick, Jr., et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Edward F. Treadwell for the petitioners and by Mr. R. M. Widney for respondent, John Widney.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, April 10 next,

Monday, April 10th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Szold, it is ordered that Louis W. Mckernan, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., it is ordered that Horace S. Whitman, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry Hertzoff, it is ordered that Joseph A. Devery, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. C. Harlen, it is ordered that Edmund Waring McLarren, Esquire, and Benjamin Lester Jacobson, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Harry Thornton Moore, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James J. O'Donohoe, it is ordered that Walter Frederick Schelp, Esquire, of St.

of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. H. Hart, it is ordered that John Rowland McCormick, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James P. McGovern, it is ordered that Michael F. O'Donnell, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Clarke Mason, it is ordered that Leonard Dawson Adkins, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Simon Lyon, it is ordered that Abraham Schwartz, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward F. Treadwell, it is ordered that Thomas P. Boyd, Esquire, of San Rafael, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roberts Walker, it is ordered that Grandin Tracy Vought, Jr., Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Park Trammell, it is ordered that W. D. Bell, Esquire, of Arcadia, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. R. Serven, it is ordered that Randolph Shirk, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John L. Cable, it is ordered that Rush Greenslade, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Bates, it is ordered that Edmund J. Wager, Esquire, of Utica, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Stitt, it is ordered that Elias B. Hartle, Esquire, of Hagerstown, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi Cooke, it is ordered that Lewis F. Jacobson, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the court in this behalf by Mr. Otto H.. Schlobohm, it is ordered that Robert Stewart Lee, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Mercer Davis, it is ordered that Eugene G. Schwinghammer, Esquire, of Atlantic City, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Oregon-Washington Railroad and Navigation Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
J. B. McGinn.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

170

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by

this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Washington in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

G. D. Collins and Roy Marshall, Appellants, vs. Colonel J. D. McDonald, Commandant of Disciplinary Barracks of the United States, Alcatraz Island, Northern District of California. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

150

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Arthur J. Dahn, Petitioner, vs. James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads of the United States. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

166

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Iowa.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

The Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Appellant,
147 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court, and, as so modified, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

(Mr. Justice Clarke took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

The Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Appellant,
147 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims for further findings,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, with directions to make a new finding of fact and modify the judgment, if need be, to accord with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Lambert Run Coal Company, Appellant,
163 vs.
The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court, and, as so modified, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of West

Virginia.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

(Mr. Justice Clarke took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

Mary Louise Greiner, Executrix under the Last Will and Testament of Kate B. Kingsley, deceased, Plaintiff in Error, vs. C. C. Lewellyn, Collector of Internal Revenue. — In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

187

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Galveston Electric Company, Appellant, vs. City of Galveston, O. H. Sappington, Mayor of the City of Galveston, J. C. Purcell, et al., Commissioners, etc. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas.

455

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Tony Vigliotti, Plaintiff in Error,
530 vs.
The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Day,
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The First National Bank of Gulfport, Mississippi, Petitioner,
136 vs.
Wirt Adams, Revenue Agent of the State of Mississippi.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

(Mr. Justice Clarke took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause).

Exporters of Manufacturers' Products, Inc.,
390 vs.
Butterworth-Judson Company.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States

Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered in the affirmative.

Whereupon, it is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Chicago and North Western Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. C. C. Whitnack Produce Company. — On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

146

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

(Mr. Justice Clarke took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

Essanay Film Manufacturing Company, Appellant, vs. William R. Kane. — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

70

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

The Standard Fashion Company, Petitioner, vs. Magrane Houston Company. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

20

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Forbes Pioneer Boat Line, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Board of Commissioners of Everglades Drainage District. 188

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Florida, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

White Oak Transportation Company, Petitioner, vs. Boston, Cape Cod and New York Canal Company. 116

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed ~~with costs~~; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts with directions that the White Oak Transportation Company exonerate the Boston,

Cape Cod and New York Canal Company from one-half of the damages and costs of Northern Coal Company in the case of Northern Coal Company, Petitioner, vs. Boston, Cape Cod and New York Canal Company, No. 124, October Term, 1921; and that the damages and costs of the White Oak Transportation Company and the Boston, Cape Cod and New York Canal Company, in this cause, be equally divided between those two companies.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Northern Coal Company, Petitioner,
124 vs.
Boston, Cape Cod and New York Canal Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts with directions that the Northern Coal Company recover its damages and costs from the Boston, Cape Cod and New York Canal Company.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Evelyn P. Ferry, Appellant,
177 vs.
Spokane, Portland and Seattle Railway Company and Central Trust Company of New York.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Monday, April 10th, 1922. continued.

Evelyn P. Perry, Appellant, Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of
250 vs. Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.
Henry L. Corbett et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The United States,
Appellant, Appeal from the Court of Claims.
127 vs.
Bethlehem Steel Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Hamilton S. Wallace,
Appellant, Appeal from the Court of Claims.
118 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the petition for rehearing and of the motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims for further findings.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition and motion be, and the same are hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Bankers Trust Company, Appeal from the District Court of the
Appellant, United States for the District of New
167 vs. Mexico.
The City of Raton and The
Raton Water Works Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Mexico, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Jesus M. Balzac, Appellant,
178 vs.
The People of Porto Rico.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of Porto Rico.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Porto Rico, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Concurring:
Mr. Justice Holmes.

Jesus M. Balzac, Appellant,
179 vs.
The People of Porto Rico.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of Porto Rico.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Porto Rico, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Concurring:
Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

Georgia Railway & Power Company et al., Appellants,
601 vs.
Railroad Commission of the State of Georgia et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned

Hartford Life Insurance Company, Appellant,
232 vs.
Garland S. Johnson, Administrator.

It is ordered by this Court that this cause be assigned for hearing on Monday, April 24th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hartford Life Insurance Company, Appellant,
232 vs.
Garland S. Johnson, Administrator of the Estate of Nannie M. Johnson, deceased.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

It is now here ordered by the Court that the order of the Chief Justice of April 3d, 1922, in this cause, viz: "Let an order issue superseding the decree of the District Court of the United States for the Southwestern Division of the Western District of Missouri, dismissing the amended bill of complaint of the appellant herein, upon the filing by the appellant in this court of a good and sufficient bond in the sum of $20,000, conditioned upon the payment of the judgment rendered in favor of the appellee and against the American Security Company by the Circuit Court of Henry County, Missouri, on the 13th day of September, 1920, for $9,334, and all costs which have accrued therein and herein, if the decree herein appealed from is affirmed by this court. And under the same bond and security let an injunction issue against the appellee, pending the final determination by this court of the appeal herein, from enforcing or undertaking to enforce said judgment of the Circuit Court of Henry County, Missouri, against the American Surety Company, and from taking any steps, pending this appeal, to compel said Surety Company to pay the judgment, by application to the insurance authorities of Missouri to revoke the license of said company to do business in the State, for failure to pay the same", be, and the same is hereby approved and ordered to be entered of record as an order of the court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles D. Newton, Attorney General, etc., et al.,
Appellants,
832 vs.
New York Mutual Gas Light Company;

Charles D. Newton, Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants,
833 vs.
The Standard Gas Light Company of the City of New York;

Charles D. Newton, Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants,
844 vs.
New Amsterdam Gas Company; and

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants,
845 vs.
The East River Gas Company of Long Island City.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases,
It is now here ordered by this Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, April 24th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Ogden Portland Cement Company, Plaintiff in Error,
555 vs.
Public Utilities Commission of Utah.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Utah.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Utah, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Union Portland Cement Company, Plaintiff in Error,
556 vs.
Public Utilities Commission of Utah.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Utah.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Utah, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Utah Idaho Central Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,
574 vs.
Public Utilities Commission of Utah.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Utah.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Utah, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Julia Lamore Mickadiet et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
198 vs.
Albert B. Fall, Secretary of the Interior.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

International Life Insurance Company, Plaintiff in Error,
797 vs.
Adrian F. Sherman.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Iowa State Bank,
Petitioner,
795 vs.
The New Amsterdam Casualty Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of

the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry Brolaski, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 802 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Insurance Company of North America, Petitioner, vs. Harry R. Brigham et al. 808 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Director General of Railroads, Petitioner, vs. Leah St. Dennis, as Administratrix, etc. 810 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sarnia Steamship Company, as Claimant, etc., Petitioner, vs. L. Telles De Vasconcellos. 818 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to

the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The San Joaquin & Kings River Canal & Irrigation Company, Inc., Petitioner,
830 vs.
W. H. Worswick, Jr., et al.
Miller & Lux, Inc., et al., Petitioners,
831 vs.
W. H. Worswick, Jr., et al.

On petition for writs of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for writs of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

T. B. Stafford et al., etc., Appellants,
687 vs.
Henry C. Wallace, Secretary, etc.

It is now here ordered by the Court that the order of the Chief Justice in this cause of April 3d, 1922, viz: "That the stay covered by the stipulation filed herein is hereby extended until the lapse of thirty days after the rendition by this Court of its decision on said appeal", be, and the same is hereby approved and ordered to be entered of record as an order of the Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James Eugene Burton et al., Appellants,
691 vs.
Charles F. Clyne, United States Attorney.

It is now here ordered by the Court that the order of the Chief Justice in this cause of April 3d, 1922, viz: "That the stay covered by the stipulation filed herein is hereby extended until the lapse of thirty days after the rendition by this court of its decision on said appeal", be, and the same is hereby approved and ordered to be entered of record as an order of the court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Complainant,
--- , Original. vs.
The State of Washington.

The motion for leave to file bill of complaint herein was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the complainant. The motion that in the event the bill of complaint is allowed to be filed that leave be granted the defendant to raise the question of the jurisdiction of this court, was submitted by Mr. Blaine Mallan for the defendant.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
213 vs.
Chris Elioff Stafoff, alias
Chris Elioff.

The motion to pass this case was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the plaintiff in error.

Justus S. Wardell, as Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.,
Petitioner,
705 vs.
James A. Blum et al., etc.

The motion to recall order of the Court denying petition for writ of certiorari was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner, with leave to counsel for the respondent to file opposition thereto within twenty days.

Albert H. Wiggin et al., etc.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
225 vs.
Francis P. Garvan, as Alien
Property Custodian.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, in behalf of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
245 vs.
Oregon Lumber Company.

The motion to pass this case was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in behalf of counsel.

Charles Glen Collins,
Appellant,
672 vs.
Victor Loisel, U. S.
Marshal, etc.

The motion to advance this case was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee.

Henry A. Wise et al.,
Petitioners,
823 vs.
Amerigus Realty Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. James H. Beck in behalf of Mr. Charles H. Tuttle and Mr. Saul S. Myers for the petitioners, and by Mr. Eugene W. Leake for the respondent.

Ex parte In the matter of Henry A. Wise and Thomas B. Felder, as Receivers in Bankruptcy for Christoffer Hannevig, Inc., Petitioners.
--- Original.

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted by Mr. James H. Beck in behalf of Mr. Charles H. Tuttle and Mr. Saul S. Myers for the petitioners.

Ex parte In the matter of Erwin Rudolph Bergdoll,
Petitioner.
--- Original.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein was submitted by Mr. Joseph D. Shewalter for the petitioner.

The Bank of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
617 vs.
Whitney Central National Bank.

The motion to advance this case was submitted by Mr.Charles Henry Butler in behalf of counsel.

Union Trust Company of San Francisco et al., Executors, etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
236 vs.
Justus S. Wardell, United States Collector, etc., et al.

On motion of Mr. J. Wallace Bryan in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief herein of Mr. J. Wallace Bryan and Mr. Charles McHenry Howard as amici curiae.

Union Trust Company of San Francisco et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
236 vs.
Justus S. Wardell, U. S. Collector, etc.; and

Harriet L. Levy et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
303 vs.
Justus S. Wardell, U. S. Collector, etc., et al.

On motion of Mr. Charles E. Hughes, Jr., for Frederick W. DeFoe, Administrator, etc., et al., leave was granted to file brief herein as amici curiae.

Victor E. Shwab, Executor, etc., Plaintiff in Error,
200 vs.
Emanuel J. Doyle, United States Collector, etc.

Leave was granted Mr. Garrett W. McEnerney, on motion, to file brief herein as amicus curiae.

Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York, Plaintiff in Error,
215 vs.
Mary S. Liebing.

The motion to dismiss the writ of error in this cause for failure of counsel for plaintiff in error to file brief within the time prescribed by the rule, was submitted by Mr. James J. O'Donohoe for the defendant in error.

John C. Knox, as surviving executor, etc., et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
602 vs.
Richard J. McElligott, as late Collector, etc.

On motion of Mr. Stark B. Ferriss in behalf of the plaintiffs in error and concurred in by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the defendant in error, it is ordered that this cause be advanced, to be heard with No. 200.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants,
750 vs.
Consolidated Gas Company of New York; and
Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants,
751 vs.
New York & Queens Gas Company

On motion of Mr. Harry Hertzoff in that behalf, it is ordered that these cases be advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, April 24th.

Oklahoma Natural Gas Company, Plaintiff in Error, 37 vs. The State of Oklahoma et al.

The motion of Mr. F. T. Eggleston for leave to file brief on behalf of the National Gas Association as amicus curiae was denied.

W. I. Porterfield et al., Appellants, 803 vs. U. S. Webb, as Attorney General of the State of California, et al.

The motion to advance this case was submitted by Mr. F. M. Brylawski in behalf of counsel for the appellants.

U. S. Webb, as Attorney General of the State of California, et al., Appellants, 737 vs. J. J. O'Brien et al.

The motion to advance and consolidate this case with No. 803 was submitted by Mr. Andrew T. Vogelsang in that behalf.

Samuel Singer, Petitioner, --- Original. vs. Richard McGinnis, Keeper of Essex County Jail.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein was submitted by Mr. J. Mercer Davis for the petitioner.

Fred Violette et al., Petitioners, 768 vs. The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Richard P. Whiteley in behalf of Mr. Joseph W. Cox and Mr. Charles A. Russell for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Kansas City, Clay County & St. Joseph Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, 290 vs. George S. Grier, Administrator, etc.

The motion to dismiss the writ of error in this case was submitted by Mr. Vinton Pike for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. John E. Dolman for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

The Washington Terminal Company, Plaintiff in Error, 664 vs. Emma G. Callahan, Administratrix, etc.

The motion to dismiss the writ of error in this case was submitted by Mr. Raymond B. Dickey and Mr. Daniel Thew Wright for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. George E. Hamilton and Mr. John J. Hamilton for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

George H. Engelhard, Receiver, etc., Appellant, 816 vs. George J. Schroeder et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this case was submitted by Mr. Harry Lane for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. Gustavus A. Rogers for the appellant in opposition thereto.

The Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway et al., Petitioners, 748 vs. The Western Union Telegraph Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Fitzgerald Hall for the petitioners, and by Mr. John S. Cooper, Mr. John A. Pitts, Mr. K. T. McConnico, Mr. Charles T. Cates, Jr., and Mr. Francis Raymond Stark for the respondent.

P. J. Camou, Petitioner, 799 vs. The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. George D. Collins for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. William C. Herron for the respondent.

Southern Oil Corporation, Petitioner, 814 vs. R. M. Waggoner.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. C. S. Arnold for the petitioner.

Fox Film Corporation, Petitioner, 825 vs. Frederick M. Knowles et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Saul E. Rogers and Mr. William J. Hughes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Louis R. Bick for the respondents.

Fox Film Corporation, Petitioner, 826 vs. Frederick M. Knowles et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Saul E. Rogers and Mr. William J. Hughes for the

James C. Davis, Director General, etc., Petitioner,
836 vs.
John Wiley Reynolds.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Edwin P. Cox and Mr. William B. McIlwaine for the petitioner, and by Mr. S. Heath Tyler and Mr. James Mann for the respondent.

Felo McAllister, Trustee, etc., Petitioner,
838 vs.
Producers Naval Stores Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Sam R. Marks for the petitioner, and by Mr. William L. Clay, Mr. Samuel B. Adams, and Mr. A. Pratt Adams for the respondents.

Public Ledger Company, Petitioner,
853 vs.
New York Times Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Thomas Hasburn White and Mr. William C. Cannon for the petitioner, and by Mr. Alfred A. Cook and Mr. Harold Nathan for the respondent.

P. J. Camou, Petitioner,
799 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion of Mr. John R. Edson for leave to file reply brief for petitioner within thirty days was denied.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants,
752 vs.
Central Union Gas Company;
and
Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants,
753 vs.
Northern Union Gas Company.

Continental Insurance Company et al., Appellants,
609 vs.
The United States of America et al.; and

These cases were reassigned for argument on April 24th next.

Seward Prosser et al., Appellants,

610 vs.

The United States of America et al.

Four hours were allowed for the reargument of these cases. The reargument was commenced by Mr. R. C. Leffingwell for the Reading Railway Company, continued by Mr. John M. Perry for the Central Union Trust Company of New York, Trustee, and by Mr. Alfred A. Cook for Continental Insurance Company.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, April 11th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry P. Blair, it is ordered that Thomas M. Debevoise, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles G. Bond, it is ordered that Born Budd, Esquire, and Francis A. Winslow, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

In the matter of
Walace Hawkins.

From a voluntary statement presented by Walace Hawkins it appears that on November 14th, 1921, while laboring under an honest mistake, he sought and obtained permission to practice here within three years after his admission to the Bar of the Supreme Court of Texas. He has returned the license issued to him, has offered satisfactory apology and explanation of his action, and has asked cancellation of the order of admission.

It is accordingly directed that the order admitting him to practice here be cancelled and that the Clerk return the admission fee.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Continental Insurance Company
et al., Appellants,

609 vs.

The United States of America et al.;

and

Seward Prosser et al., Appellants,

610 vs.

The United States of America et al.

The reargument in these cases was continued by Mr. Alfred A. Cook for the Continental Insurance Company, by Mr. George W. Wickersham for Adrian Iselin et al., by Mr. J. M. Hartfield for Prosser et al., and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for The United States.

The United States of America, Appellant,
5 vs.
Southern Pacific Company et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf, five and one-half hours were allowed for the reargument of this case. The reargument was commenced by Mr. Edward F. McClennen for the appellant.

William Irwin, Appellant,
110 vs.
Sam F. Webb, County Treasurer of Maricopa County, State of Arizona, et al.

Mr. Patrick H. Loughran, of counsel for the appellant, suggested the retirement from office of Sam F. Webb, as County Treasurer; C. W. Cummins, as County Assessor; L. M. Laney, as County Attorney; W. K. Bowen, as County Supervisor; and C. W. Peterson, as County Supervisor of Maricopa County, State of Arizona, parties appellees in this cause, and moved the Court to make Vernon S. Wright, present County Treasurer; Harry Pierce, present County Assessor; R. E. L. Shepherd, present County Attorney; Guy F. Vernon, present County Supervisor, and C. S. Steward, present County Supervisor of Maricopa County, State of Arizona, parties appellees herein.

WHEREUPON, IT IS NOW HERE ORDERED BY THE COURT that Vernon S. Wright, present County Treasurer; Harry Pierce, present County Assessor; R. E. L. Shepherd, present County Attorney; Guy F. Vernon, present County Supervisor, and C. S. Steward, present County Supervisor of Maricopa County, State of Arizona, be, and they are hereby made parties appellees in this cause in the place of Sam F. Webb, former County Treasurer; C. W. Cummins, former County Assessor; L. M. Laney, former County Attorney; W. K. Bowen, former County Supervisor, and C. W. Peterson, former County Supervisor of Maricopa County, State of Arizona, retired from office.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, April 12th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices.
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
John H. Clarke,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward F. McClennen, it is ordered that Davis G. Arnold, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Brent Spence, it is ordered that Matt Herold, Esquire, of Newport, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hewett G. Robertson, it is ordered that David G. Stember, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward S. Brashears, it is ordered that Clark J. Milliron, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America, Appellant,
5 vs.
Southern Pacific Company et al.

One hour additional was allowed for the reargument of this case. The reargument was continued by Mr. E. F. McClennen for the appellant, by Mr. Garret W. McEnerney for the appellees, by Mr. Joseph P. Blair for the appellees, and

by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, April 13th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Max G. Cohen, it is ordered that Henry B. Singer, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otto A. Schlobohm, it is ordered that Charles Gerson Loeb, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Ex parte In the matter of Toledo Scale Company, Petitioner. --- Original.

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of prohibition and a writ of mandamus herein was submitted by Mr. George D. Welles for the petitioner.

The United States of America, Appellant, 5 vs. Southern Pacific Company et al.

The reargument of this case was concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellant.

Augustus S. Worthington, et al., etc.,

268 vs.

The District of Columbia.

This case was argued by Mr. Vernon E. West for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. F. H. Stephens for the defendant in error.

The South Covington & Cincinnati Street Railway Company et al., Appellants,

203 vs.

The City of Newport, Kentucky.

This case was argued by Mr. A. C. Cassatt for the appellants, and by Mr. Brent Spence for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, April 17th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that William F. Purdy, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, and F. Regis Noel, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court inthis behalf by Mr. Charles L. McNary, it is ordered that Lawrence A. Liljeqvist, Esquire, William W. Banks, Esquire, and Arthur I. Moulton, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, and Willis S. Moore, Esquire, of Salem, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George P. Barse, it is ordered that R. L. Carlock, Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Camden R. McAtee, it is ordered that Eugene R. Attkisson, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Garrard

Glenn, it is ordered that Harold R. Medina, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George M. Morris, it is ordered that John E. Hughes, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper, it is ordered that Charles E. Wythe, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Mansfield Ferry, it is ordered that Russell L. Bradford, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Texas Company, Appellant,
126 vs.
J. J. Brown, Individually and as Commissioner of Agriculture of Georgia, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

United Shoe Machinery Corporation et al., Appellants,
119 vs.
The United States of America.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna.
(Mr. Justice Brandeis took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Charles Walter Moreland. — On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

529

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Brandeis,
Mr. Chief Justice Taft,
Mr. Justice Holmes.
(Mr. Justice Clarke took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Ex parte In the matter of Wise & Felder, Receivers, Petitioner. --- Original. — On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Complainant, --- Original. vs. The State of Washington. — On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and process is ordered to issue returnable on Monday, October 2, 1922.

Ex parte In the matter of
Samuel Singer, Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of
Toledo Scale Company,
Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of prohibition and a writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, without prejudice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Glen Collins, Appellant,
672 vs.
Victor Loisel, United States Marshal, etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 24th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Bank of America, Plaintiff in Error,
617 vs.
Whitney Central National Bank.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, without prejudice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. I. Porterfield et al., Appellants,
803 vs.
U. S. Webb, as Attorney General of the State of California, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 13th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

U. S. Webb, as Attorney General of the State of California, et al., Appellants, 757 vs. J. J. O'Brien et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance and consolidate with No. 603,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 13th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York, Plaintiff in Error, 215 vs. Mary S. Liebing.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss for failure of plaintiff in error to file brief in the time prescribed by the rule be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause in the regular call of the docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Washington Terminal Company, Plaintiff in Error, 664 vs. Emma G. Callahan, Administratrix, etc.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kansas City, Clay County & St. Joseph Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, 290 vs. George S. Grier, Administrator, etc.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George H. Engelhard, Receiver, etc., Appellant, 816 vs.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fox Film Corporation, Petitioner,
825 vs.
Frederick M. Knowles et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fox Film Corporation, Petitioner,
826 vs.
Frederick M. Knowles et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway et al.,
Petitioners,
748 vs.
The Western Union Telegraph Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fred Violette et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 768

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

P. J. Camou, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 799

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Oil Corporation, Petitioner, vs. R. M. Waggoner. 814

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry A. Wise et al., Petitioners, vs. Amerigus Realty Corporation. 823

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court

that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Director General, etc., Petitioner,
836 vs.
John Wiley Reynolds.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Felo McAllister, Trustee, etc., Petitioner,
838 vs.
Producers Naval Stores Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Public Ledger Company, Petitioner,
853 vs.
New York Times Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William E. Woodbridge,

Appellant,

887 vs.

The United States.

Mr. Solicitor General Beck, of counsel for the appellee, having filed in open Court the following certificate, to wit:

"I, F. C. Kleinschmidt, Assistant Clerk of the Court of Claims of the United States, do hereby certify that in a certain cause pending in said Court, wherein William E. Woodbridge was complainant and the United States was defendant, final decree was rendered by said Court of Claims on the 22d day of March, A. D. 1920, in favor of the said United States and against the said William E. Woodbridge, and that on the 10th day of September, A. D. 1920, said William E. Woodbridge prayed an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States, which was allowed.

In testimony whereof, I hereunto subscribe my name and affix the seal of said Court of Claims at the City of Washington, District of Columbia, this 10th day of April, A. D. 1922.

(Signed) F. C. KLEINSCHMIDT,

Assistant Clerk,"

(SEAL).

and moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the ninth rule.

And it appearing to the Court that the appellant has failed to have its cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court,

It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the appeal in this cause from the Court of Claims be, and the same is hereby, docketed and dismissed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Minna Lombard Crichton, Appellant,
312 vs.
Maggie L. Wingfield.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

PETITION FOR REHEARING.

By the Court:

Upon consideration of the petition of the appellant for rehearing,

It is ordered that the last sentence in the fourth paragraph of the opinion of this Court, filed February 27, 1922, be modified so as to read: "It was before the qualification of the appellant as executrix under her mother's will that she took the notes to New York."

The petition for rehearing is denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joe Ali et al., Appellants,
62 vs.
David Lehrhaupt, Immigration Inspector, etc.

The motion to dismiss the appeal in this case was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee in support of the motion.

Greenport Basin & Construction Company, Plaintiff in Error and Appellant,
251 vs.
The United States.

The motion to pass this case was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the defendant in error and appellee.

The United States of America ex rel. John W. French, Plaintiff in Error,
724 vs.
John W. Weeks, Secretary of War; and
The United States of America ex rel. William F.
Green, Plaintiff in Error,

725 vs.
John W. Weeks, Secretary of War.

On motion, leave was granted Mr. Daniel W. Iddings to file brief herein as amicus curiae.

Union Trust Company of San Francisco et al., Executors, etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
236 vs.
Justus S. Wardell, United States Collector, etc., et al.

On motion of Mr. Mansfield Ferry for Farmers' Loan & Trust Company, Trustee, leave was granted to file brief herein as amicus curiae.

Virginia Bailey et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
239 vs.
Oregon-Washington Railroad & Navigation Company et al.

The motion to dismiss the writ of error in this case was submitted by Mr. Charles H. Bates in behalf of Mr. H.W. Clark, Mr. A. C. Spencer, and Mr. John F. Reilly for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Thomas Mannix and Mr. George Arthur Brown for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

John P. Kline et al., etc., Petitioners,
321 vs.
Burke Construction Company.

The motion to advance this case was submitted by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt in that behalf.

The New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Company, Petitioner,
391 vs.
John W. Kinney.

The motion to advance this case was submitted by Mr. John Hamilton in that behalf.

Ex parte In the Matter of Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland et al., Petitioners.
--- Original.

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted by Mr. Charles Markell, Mr. Edward Osgood Brown and Mr. Edwin J. Marshall for the petitioners.

Boston & Maine Railroad Company, Petitioner,
817 vs.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Francis P. Garland for the petitioner, and by Mr.

William Page et al., Petitioners, 819 vs. The United States of America.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Frank J. Murphy for the petitioner, with leave to counsel for the respondent to file brief within three days.
C. E. Schaff, Receiver, etc., Petitioner, 822 vs. Mrs. Sarah Morris, Administratrix, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Joseph M. Bryson, Mr. Alex. Britton, and Mr. A. H. McKnight for the petitioner, and by Mr. Cone Johnson and Mr. James M. Edwards for the respondent.
The City National Bank of El Paso, Texas, Petitioner, 824 vs. El Paso & Northeastern Railroad Company et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. A. H. Culwell for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. A. Hawkins, Mr. William R. Harr, and Mr. Charles H. Bates for the respondent.
Miss Mary E. Cox, Petitioner, 827 vs. Mrs. Mary A. Phillips.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Purnell M. Milner and Mr. J. Hirsh for the petitioner.
John R. Markley et al., etc., Petitioners, 840 vs. John C. Sheats, Receiver, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Vernon R. Loucks and Mr. Henry J. Scott for the petitioners, and by Mr. Owen J. Roberts for the respondent.
Frank G. Gardner, as Trustee, etc., Petitioner, 846 vs. Chicago Title & Trust Company, Receiver, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Henry M. Wolf, Mr. A.F. Reichmann, and Mr. Arthur M. Cox for the petitioner.
Charles H. John, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Northwestern Bridge & Iron Company, Petitioner, 848 vs. Interstate Iron & Steel Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Paul D. Durant for the petitioner, and by Mr. Jacob Newman, Mr. Edward R. Johnston, and Mr. Joseph V. Quarles for the respondent.

Clarence H. Venner, Petitioner,
849 vs.
Southern Pacific Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Elijah N. Zoline for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. P. Blair and Mr. Gordon M. Buck for the respondent.

Steam Tug William H. Taylor, her engines, etc., Petitioner,
850 vs.
Standard Oil Company of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Chauncey I. Clark for the petitioner, and by Mr. C. D. Duncan and Mr. Warner Pyne for the respondent.

Edwin Forrest, Petitioner,
851 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. H. W. Hutton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. William C. Herron for the respondents.

George F. Hinrichs (Inc.), Petitioner,
867 vs.
Standard Trust & Savings Bank.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Francis A. Winslow and Mr. Bern Budd for the petitioner, and by Mr. Otto C. Wierum for the respondent.

Victor E. Shwab, Executor, etc., Plaintiff in Error,
200 vs.
Emanuel J. Doyle, United States Collector, etc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. W. F. Keeney for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. James A. Fowler for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. J. J. Vertrees for the plaintiff in error.

Union Trust Company of San Francisco et al., Executors, etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
236 vs.
Justus S. Wardell, United States Collector, etc., et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Garret W. McEnerney for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, April 18th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Weston, it is ordered that Walter T. Fisher, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Selden P. Spencer, it is ordered that George W. Crowder, Esquire, of Carthage, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David F. Simpson, it is ordered that Harold G. Simpson, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas S. Crago, it is ordered that Henry W. Watson, Esquire, of Langhorne, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward S. Bailey, it is ordered that Pauline M. Floyd and Charles H. Bradley, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Edward Thomas, it is ordered that A. L. Barber, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Vincent M. Brennan, it is ordered that Edward Command, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry L. Myers, it is ordered that Edwin S. Booth, Esquire, of Baker, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Marbury, it is ordered that L. Edwin Goldman, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Union Trust Company of San Francisco et al., Executors, etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
236 vs.
Justus S. Wardell, United States Collector, etc., et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Garret W. McEnerney for the plaintiffs in error, and was concluded by Mr. James A. Fowler for the defendants in error.

Harriet L. Levy et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
503 vs.
Justus S. Wardell, United States Collector, etc., et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Edward F. Treadwell for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. James A. Fowler for the defendants in error.

John C. Knox, as Surviving Executor, etc., et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
602 vs.
Richard J. McElligott, as late Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. Stark B. Ferriss for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. James A. Fowler for the defendant in error.

Tuesday, April 18th, 1922, continued.

Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
199 vs.
Kye Schneider Fowler Company.

This case was argued by Mr. Garrard Glenn for the defendant in error, and submitted by Mr. Wymer Dressler, Mr. T. P. Littlepage and Mr. P. W. Sargent for the plaintiff in error.

Great Northern Railway Company et al., Petitioners,
202 vs.
Merchants Elevator Company.

This case was argued by Mr. John F. Finerty for the petitioners, and by Mr. Harold G. Simpson for the respondent.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, April 19th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edmund H. Parry, it is ordered that Maddock S.Blumenthal, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Benjamin S. Minor, it is ordered that Samuel A. Besson, Esquire, of Hoboken, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. R. Prince, it is ordered that Thomas W. Davis, Esquire, of Wilmington, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Charles Glen Collins, Appellant,
672 vs.
Victor Loisel, U. S. Marshal, etc.

The motion to reassign this case for hearing was submitted by Mr. Guion Miller for the appellant.

Roth Dixon et al., Appellants, vs. Jesse H. Cox et al. 209

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sarah F. Donley, Petitioner, vs. Erwin Ray Van Horn. 211

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the District Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Second Division, of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the District Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Second Division, of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sarah F. Donley, Petitioner, vs. Prescott West. 212

On petition for writ of certiorari to the District Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Second Division, of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the District Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Second Division, of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Plaintiff in Error, 213 vs. Chris Elioff Stafoff, alias Chris Elioff.	This case was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.
Federal Base Ball Club of Baltimore (Inc.), Plaintiff in Error, 204 vs. National League of Professional Baseball Clubs et al.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Charles A. Douglas for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. George Wharton Pepper for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. William L. Marbury for the plaintiff in error.
John A. Grogan, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., Appellant, 615 vs. Hiram Walker & Sons, Ltd.; and The Anchor Line (Henderson Bros., Ltd.,) Appellant, 639 vs. George W. Aldridge, Collector, etc.	The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Goff for the appellants in No. 615 and the appellee in No. 639, continued by Mr. Alfred Lucking for the appellee in No. 615, and concluded by Mr. Lucius H. Beers for the appellant in No. 639.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, April 20th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fritz G. Lanham, it is ordered that Wilmot M. Odell, Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Olive Stott Gabriel, it is ordered that Dorothy Brooks, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

Royal Baking Powder Company,
Appellant,
218 vs.
George W. Emerson, Prosecuting Attorney, etc.

This case was continued, per stipulation.

Toledo Scale Company,
Petitioner,
891 vs.
The Computing Scale Company.

Petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the motion for a stay,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the prayer of the petitioner be granted and that an order staying further proceedings in the United

States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit until this Court shall have considered and acted upon the petition for certiorari this day filed, be granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Albert B. Fall, Secretary of the Interior, Plaintiff in Error,
205 vs.
The United States of America ex rel. W. T. Mosier et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. C. Edward Wright for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. T. J. Leahy for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. Edwin S. Booth for the plaintiff in error.

The United States of America ex rel. John W. French, Plaintiff in Error,
724 vs.
John W. Weeks, Secretary of War; and
The United States of America ex rel. William P. Creary, Plaintiff in Error,
725 vs.
John W. Weeks, Secretary of War.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Samuel T. Ansell for the plaintiffs in error, continued by Mr. Frederick M. Brown and Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Charles Pope Caldwell for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, April 21st, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke, - Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Will R. King, it is ordered that Erwin R. Effler, Esquire, of Toledo, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur P. Greeley, it is ordered that Clarence Ladd-Davis, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George M. Morris, it is ordered that Clifford H. Browder, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Charles Olin, Appellant,
246vs.
Perry Kitzmiller et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Arthur I. Moulton for the appellant, and by Mr. Willis S. Moore and Mr. W. W. Banks for the appellees.

Rainier Brewing Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
267 vs.
Great Northern Pacific
Steamship Company.

This case was argued by Mr. S. J. Wettrick for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Charles A. Hart for the defendant in error.

Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland, Appellant, 207 vs. The United States; and Fidelity & Deposit Company of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Appellant, 208 vs. The United States.	These cases were argued by Mr. George Sutherland for the appellants, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Lovett for the appellee.
Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York, Plaintiff in Error, 215 vs. Mary S. Liebing.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. J. J. O'Donohoe for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, April 24th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis Van Devanter,

Mahlon Pitney,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

John H. Clarke,

Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that Anson Getman, Esquire, of Johnstown, State of New York, and Robert H. Marr, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William M. Williams, it is ordered that Perry W. Turner, Esquire, of Birmingham, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jay R. Benton, it is ordered that Arthur E. Seagrave, Esquire, of Fall River, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. H. Carrigan, it is ordered that Alexander H. Britain, Esquire, and William C. Witcher, Esquire, of Wichita Falls, and Alvin Clark Owsley, Esquire, of Denton, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Kenneth D. McKellar, it is ordered that J. L. Levine, Esquire, of Chattanooga, State

of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. M. Bracelen, it is ordered that Claude Nowlin, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first madeto the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank B. Kellogg, it is ordered that Alfred Huger, Esquire, of Charleston, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. P. Freeling, it is ordered that E. M. Landrum, Esquire, of Vinita, and Estelle Balfour Bennett and W. A. Durant, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Neyle Colquitt, it is ordered that Edmund H. Abrahams, Esquire, of Savannah, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. J. Howard, it is ordered that Sewall Myer, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. A. Keeling, it is ordered that Paul D. Page, Esquire, of Bastrop, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Riter, it is ordered that William A. Hilton, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Federal Trade Commission,

Petitioner,

335 vs.
Winsted Hosiery Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said UnitedStates Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Ex parte In the matter of Erwin R. Bergdoll, Petitioner. --- Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland et al., Petitioners. --- Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to defer reprinting the previous record on application for a writ of certiorari,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland et al., Petitioners. --- Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John P. Kline et al., etc., Petitioners,
321 vs.
Burke Construction Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Company, Petitioner,
391 vs.
John W. Kinney.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joe Ali et al., Appellants,
62 vs.
David Lehrhaupt, Immigration Inspector, etc.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Virginia Bailey et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
259 vs.
Oregon-Washington Railroad & Navigation Company.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Greenport Basin & Construction Company, Plaintiff in Error

231 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to pass, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The City National Bank of El Paso, Petitioner,
824 vs.
El Paso & Northeastern Railroad Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Eighth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Eighth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank C. Gardner, as Trustee in Bankruptcy, etc., Petitioner,
846 vs.
Chicago Title & Trust Company, Receiver, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. ChiefJustice Taft.

Boston & Maine Railroad Company, Petitioner,
817 vs.
George B. Sullivan.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of

the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Page et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

819

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. E. Schaff, Receiver, etc., Petitioner, vs. Mrs. Sarah Morris, Administratrix, etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Fifth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

822

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Fifth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Miss Mary E. Cox, Petitioner, vs. Mrs. Mary A. Phillips. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

827

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by thisCourt that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John R. Markley et al., Petitioners, vs. John O. Sheats, Receiver, etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

840

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the

United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles H. John, as Trustee, etc., Petitioner,
848 vs.
Interstate Iron & Steel Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Clarence H. Venner, Petitioner,
849 vs.
Southern Pacific Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Steam Tug William H. Taylor, her engines, etc., Petitioner,
850 vs.
Standard Oil Company of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edwin Forrest, Petitioner,
851 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George F. Hinrichs (Inc.),
Petitioner,
867 vs.
Standard Trust & Savings Bank.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

ORDER.

The call of the docket will be suspended for the term on Friday the twenty-eighth instant, and the Court will take a recess from Monday, May first to Monday, May fifteenth.

ORDER.

No petitions for writs of certiorari or motions, except motions for admission to practice, will be received after Monday, May twenty-ninth next.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
244 vs.
Vito Lanza et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf, it is ordered that this case be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26.

Blamberg Brothers, Appellant,
512 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance this case was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf.

James L. Brooks,
591 vs.

The United States of America.

The motion to advance this case was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf.

The State of North Dakota, Complainant, 12, Original. vs. The State of Minnesota.

The motion to fix time and circumstances for taking additional testimony herein was submitted by Mr. Frank B. Kellogg in behalf of counsel for the defendant.

Ex parte In the matter of Harley-Davidson Motor Company et al., Petitioners. 26, Original.

The motion for judgment notwithstanding the rule to show cause herein was submitted by Mr. Melville Church, Mr. Edwin B. H. Tower, Jr., and Mr. William S. Hodges for the petitioner.

Alabama Power Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error, 741 vs. Banks S. Talmadge, as Administrator, etc.

The motion to dismiss or affirm herein was submitted by Mr. E. W. Pettus and Mr. Ogden Persons for the defendant in error in support of the motion, with leave to Mr. William W. Williams in behalf of counsel for the plaintiffs in error to file brief in opposition thereto within three weeks.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, 20, Original. vs. The State of Texas.

On motion of Mr. John S. Flannery in that behalf, the Seventh Report of the Receiver herein was filed.

The United States of America ex rel. Robert A. Widenmann, Plaintiff in Error, 92 vs. Charles E. Hughes, Secretary of State, etc.

The motion requesting that the Court deliver an opinion in this case was submitted by Mr. George W. Tucker and Mr. Everett V. Abbot for the plaintiff in error in support of the motion.

County of Shasta, Petitioner, 859 vs. The Mountain Copper Company (Limited).

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Edward Hohfeld for the petitioner, and by Mr. C. W. Durbrow for the respondent.

County of Shasta,

860 vs.
The Mountain Copper Company
(Limited).

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Edward Hohfeld for the petitioner, and by Mr. C. W. Durbrow for the respondent.

County of Shasta, Petitioner,
861 vs.
Balaklala Consolidated Copper Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Edward Hohfeld for the petitioner.

Walker D. Hines, Director General of Railroads, Plaintiff in Error,
505 vs.
Abraham J. Elias.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American & British Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
852 vs.
C. W. McNear (Inc.)

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Ralph M. Greenlaw and Mr. William Dewey Loucks for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles F. Choate, Jr., for the respondent.

The Cincinnati, Indianapolis & Western Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
858 vs.
The Indianapolis Union Railway Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Morison R. Waite and Mr. John R. Schindel for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lawrence Maxwell, Mr. Joseph S. Graydon and Mr. Albert Baker for the respondent.

William Nelson Cromwell & Louise H. Cramer, as Executors of Frank Leslie, deceased, Petitioners,
862 vs.
Annie S. Simons.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Edgar T. Brackett and Mr. Philip L. Miller for the petitioners, and by Mr. Roger Foster for the respondent.

Ike Lewischn, Petitioner,
864 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Lewis F. Jacobson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. George E. Boren for the respondent.

Cantrell & Cochrane (Limited), Petitioner,
871 vs.
Hygeia Distilled Water Company (Inc.)

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Oscar W. Jeffery for the petitioner.

Kokusai Kisen Kabushiki Kaisha, Petitioner,
878 vs.
Argos Mercantile Corporation, as Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. George C.Sprague for the petitioner, and by Mr. Walter C. Noyes for the respondent.

Kokusai Kisen Kabushiki Kaisha, Petitioner,
879 vs.
Frederick E. Crotois, as Trustee for L. French & Company (Limited).

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. George C. Sprague for the petitioner, and by Mr. Walter C. Noyes for the respondent.

Port of New York Stevedoring Corporation, Petitioner,
886 vs.
Michael Castagna.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Bertrand L. Pettigrew for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harold R. Medina for respondent.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company, Petitioner,
893 vs.
Frank Skoczyla, Administrator, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein wassubmitted by Mr. George S. Hobart for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank M. Hardenbrook for the respondent.

Hartford Life Insurance Company, Appellant,
252 vs.
Garland S. Johnson, Administrator, etc.

This case was submitted by Mr. James C. Jones, Mr. Lon O. Hocker, Mr. Frank H. Sullivan, Mr. George F. Haid, and Mr. James C. Jones, Jr., for the appellant, and by Mr. Matthew A. Fyke for the appellee.

Charles Glen Collins, Appellant,
672 vs.
Victor Loisel, U. S. Marshal for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

The motion to reassign this case for argument was denied.

Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York, Plaintiff in Error,
215 vs.
Mary S. Liebing.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. James J. O'Donohoe for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt for the plaintiff in error.

John Doe, Demise of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts,
Plaintiff,
--- Original. vs.
The City of Rochester; and
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts,
Plaintiff,
--- Original. vs.
Eugene Van Voorhis et al., Commissioners of Appraisal.

These cases were argued on the motions for leave to file declaration herein by Mr. E. H. Abbot, Jr., for the plaintiffs, and by Mr. Eugene Van Voorhis for Van Voorhis et al.

John Doe, Demise of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts,
Plaintiff,
--- Original. vs.
The City of Rochester; and
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts,
Plaintiff,
--- Original. vs.
Eugene Van Voorhis et al.,
Commissioners of Appraisal.

On consideration of the motions for leave to file declarations herein, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, denied, without prejudice to filing of motions for leave to file bills in equity for the same purpose.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts,
Complainant,
--- Original. vs.
The State of New York et al.

The motion for leave to file bill of complaint herein was submitted by Mr. Edwin H. Abbot, Jr., and Mr. J. Weston Allen for the complainant.

Cleve Edwards, Plaintiff in Error,
216 vs.

This case was submitted by Mr. Carl E. Davis for the plaintiff in error, and

Monday, April 24th, 1922, continued.

The Wichita Railroad & Light Company, Appellant,
217 vs.
The Public Utilities Commission of the State of Kansas et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Henry I. Green for the appellant, continued by Mr. H. L. McCune for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Henry I. Green for the appellant.

The City of Houston, Appellant,
219 vs.
Southwestern Bell Telephone Company; and
Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, Appellant,
220 vs.
The City of Houston et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. W. J. Howard for the City of Houston.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, April 25th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Anthony J. Griffin, it is ordered that J. Clifford McChristie, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Herron, it is ordered that Ben B. Wickham, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletcher, it is ordered that Simon Pierre Robineau, Esquire, of Miami, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John M. C. Smith, it is ordered that Marvin J. Schaberg, Esquire, of Kalamazoo, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Ex parte In the matter of Erwin R. Bergdoll, Petitioner. --- Original.

The motion for reconsideration of motion for leave to file petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein was submitted by Mr. J. D. Shewalter for the petitioner.

The City of Houston,
Appellant,
219 vs.
Southwestern Bell
Telephone Company; and
Southwestern Bell Telephone
Company, Appellant,
220 vs.
The City of Houston et al.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. W. J. Howard for the City of Houston, by Mr. C. M. Bracelin and Mr. Nelson Phillips for the Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, and concluded by Mr. Sewall Myer for the City of Houston.

American Smelting & Refining
Company, Appellant,
221 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. William B. King for the appellant, continued by Mr. William C. Herron for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. George A. King for the appellant.

John Barton Payne, Agent,
etc., et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
222 vs.
Industrial Board of Illinois
et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Michael M. Doyle for the defendants in error, and the case submitted by Mr. George B. Gillespie and Mr. H. M. Quigley for the plaintiffs in error.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
20, Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

Six and one-half hours were allowed for the argument of this case. The argument was commenced by Mr. W. W. Dyar for The United States.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, April 26th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Vincent M. Brennan, it is ordered that Philip A. McHugh, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi H. David, it is ordered that Carter B. Keene, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. P. Wells, it is ordered that Percy Atwood Shay, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William N. Vaile, it is ordered that Todd C. Storer, Esquire, of Pueblo, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. W. Dyar, it is ordered that Edwin R. Wakefield, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Wednesday, April 26th, 1922, continued.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas W. Gregory, it is ordered that Robert Gordon, Esquire, of Miami, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander E. Horn, it is ordered that Charles Bechhoefer, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, and Leopold Hammel, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced that the Court will adjourn tomorrow at 2 o'clock to attend the dedication of the memorial to Gen. Ulysses S. Grant, late President of the United States.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
20, Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. W. W. Dyar for The United States, by Mr. Thomas W. Gregory and Mr. W. A. Keeling for the defendant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, April 27th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank B. Kellogg, it is ordered that Oscar J. Larson, Esquire, of Duluth, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David P. Wolhaupter, it is ordered that Joseph M. Hargedon, Esquire, of Lawrence, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Phil D. Swing, it is ordered that John Alden Ryan, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, 20, Original. vs. The State of Texas. The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey for Texas Patented Land Owners, by Mr. W. W. Dyar for the United States, and concluded by Mr. S. P. Freeling for the complainant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, April 28th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick W. Dallinger, it is ordered that Charles C. Bucknam, Esquire, and Alexander Irving Peckham, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Clague, it is ordered that William C. Owens, Esq., of Williston, State of North Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Ex parte In the matter of Carl Parker.
--- Original.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein was submitted by Mr. Walter Holland for the petitioner.

Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California, Petitioner,
224 vs.
James C. Davis, as Agent, etc.

This case was submitted by Mr. Warren H. Pillsbury for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. S. Halsted, Mr. Alex. Britton, and Mr. Charles H. Bates for the respondent.

Willard M. Lindsey, Appellant,
226 vs.
J. Weston Allen, Attorney General, etc., et al.

This case was submitted by Mr. Hector M. Hitchings and Mr. Henry N. Rice for the appellant, and by Mr. J. Weston Allen and Mr. Arthur E. Seagrave for the appellees.

Keokuk & Hamilton Bridge Company, Plaintiff in Error,
228 vs.
The People of the State of Illinois ex rel. John H. McCallister, County Treasurer, etc.

This case was submitted by Mr. F. T. Hughes for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Lee Siebenborn and Mr. Clifton J. O'Harra for the defendant in error.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants,
750 vs.
Consolidated Gas Company of New York;

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants,
751 vs.
New York & Queens Gas Company;

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants,
752 vs.
Central Union Gas Company;

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants,
753 vs.
Northern Union Gas Company;

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants,
832 vs.
New York Mutual Gas Light Company;

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants,

833 vs.
The Standard Gas Light
Company of the City of
New York;
Charles D. Newton, as
Attorney General, etc.,
et al., Appellants,
844 vs.
New Amsterdam Gas Company;
and
Charles D. Newton, as
Attorney General, etc.,
et al., Appellants,
845 vs.
The East River Gas Company
of Longisland City.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Harry Hertzoff for the appellants in Nos. 750 and 751; continued by Mr. William Schuyler Jackson for the appellants in Nos. 752 and 753; by Mr. Judson Hyatt for the appellants in Nos. 832, 833, 844, and 845; by Mr. John A. Garver for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. William L. Ransom for the appellees. Leave was granted to file additional briefs by Wednesday next.

Charles Glen Collins,
Appellant,
672 vs.
Victor Loisel, U. S.
Marshal for the Eastern
District of Louisiana.

This case was argued by Mr. Guion Miller and Mr. Edgar Allen Poe for the appellant, and by Mr. Robert H. Marr for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

The call of the docket has been suspended for the term.

Monday, May 1st, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Goff, it is ordered that Ira E. Robinson, Esquire, of Grafton, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leonidas C. Dyer, it is ordered that Eugene M. Schwarzenberg, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank B. Kellogg, it is ordered that H. Bert Knowles, Esquire, of Gloucester, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert H. Lovett, it is ordered that Hiram E. Todd, Esquire, of Peoria, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harold R. Young, it is ordered that Seth W. Norwood, Esquire, of Portland, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert H. Todd, it is ordered that O. M. Wood, Esquire, of San Juan, Porto Rico, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jennings C. Wise, it is ordered that John S. Wise, Jr., Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert N. Miller, it is ordered that Edgar W. Hunt, Esquire, of Trenton, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Bates, it is ordered that Bruce Mason, Esquire, of Long Beach, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
20, Original. vs.
State of Texas, Defendant.
The United States of America,
Intervener.

The Red River within Oklahoma is held unnavigable and that State's claim to the river bed, based on the asserted navigability of the river, is rejected; riparian claims to the river bed between the one hundredth degree of west longitude and the North fork of the river, based on the ownership of lands on the north bank, is sustained, but is held to extend only to the medial line of the river; conflicts among these riparian claims are adjusted; and claims to the river bed under placer mining locations rejected. Parties in interest are given twenty days within which to submit a proper form of decree disposing of all these claims in conformity with the views expressed in the opinion of the court.

Opinion by Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Sloan Shipyards Corporation
et al., Appellants,
308 vs.
United States Shipping Board
Emergency Fleet Corporation

and The United States of America.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:
The Chief Justice,
Mr. Justice Van Devanter,
Mr. Justice Clarke.

Astoria Marine Iron Works,
Plaintiff in Error,
376 vs.
United States Shipping Board
Emergency Fleet Corporation.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:
The Chief Justice,
Mr. Justice Van Devanter,
Mr. Justice Clarke.

United States Shipping Board

Representing The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Roger B. Wood, Trustee in Bankruptcy. 526

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Concurring:
The Chief Justice,
Mr. Justice Van Devanter,
Mr. Justice Clarke.

Victor E. Shwab, Executor of the Last Will and Testament of Augusta J. Dickol, deceased, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Emanuel J. Doyle, United States Collector of Internal Revenue for the Fourth Collection District of Michigan. 200

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration thereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals

in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Michigan for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Union Trust Company of San Francisco et al., Executors, etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
236 vs.
Justus S. Wardell, United States Collector of Internal Revenue for the First District of California, et al.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Harriet L. Levy, Pauline Jacobs and Adeline Salinger,
Plaintiffs in Error,
303 vs.
Justus S. Wardell, United States Collector of Internal Revenue for the First District of California, and John L. Flynn, United States Collector of Internal Revenue for the First District of California.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of

California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

John C. Knox, as Surviving Executor of the Last Will and Testament of Jonas B. Kissam, deceased, et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
602 vs.
Richard J. McElligott, as Late Collector of Internal Revenue for the Third District of New York.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

T. B. Stafford and S. B. Stafford, Copartners, doing business as Stafford Bros., et al., Appellants,
687 vs.
Henry C. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture, and Charles F. Clyne, United States Attorney for the Northern District of Illinois.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from

the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.
(Mr. Justice Day took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

James Eugene Burton et al., Appellants, vs. Charles F. Clyne, United States District Attorney for the Northern District of Illinois. 691 — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.
(Mr. Justice Day took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the court:

Ex Parte In the Matter of Erwin R. Bergdoll, Petitioner. --- Original. — On consideration of the motion for a reconsideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Monday, May 1st, 1922, continued.

The State of North Dakota, Complainant, 12, Original. vs. The State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the motion to fix time for taking additional testimony,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, pursuant to the stipulation fixed by the parties.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel. Robert A. Widenmann, Plaintiff in Error, 92 vs. Charles E. Hughes, as Secretary of State, etc.

On consideration of the motion requesting the Court to deliver an opinion in this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Complainant, --- Original. vs. The State of New York.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint in this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and process is ordered to issue returnable on Monday, October 2d, 1922.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex Parte In the Matter of Carl Parker, Petitioner. --- Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Blamberg Brothers, Appellant, 512 vs. The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 20th, next.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James L. Brooks
591 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 13th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American & British Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
852 vs.
C. W. McNear, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Rhode Island.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Rhode Island, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Cincinnati, Indianapolis & Western Railroad Company, Petitioner,
858 vs.
The Indianapolis Union Railway Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

County of Shasta, Petitioner,
859 vs.
The Mountain Copper Company, Limited.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

County of Shasta, Petitioner, vs. The Mountain Copper Company, Limited. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

860

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

County of Shasta, Petitioner, vs. Balaklala Consolidated Copper Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

861

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Nelson Cromwell et al., as Executors, etc., Petitioners, vs. Annie S. Simons. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

862

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ike Lewisohn, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

864

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of

the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cantrell & Cochrane, Limited, Petitioner, vs. Hygeia Distilled Water Company, Inc.

871

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kokusai Kisen Kabushiki Kaisha, Petitioner, vs. Argos Mercantile Corporation, as Trustee for L. French & Company, Limited.

878

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kokusai Kisen Kabushiki Kaisha, Petitioner, vs. Frederick E. Crotois, as Trustee, etc.

879

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Port of New York Stevedoring Corporation, Petitioner, 886 vs. Michael Castagna. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company, Petitioner, 893 vs. Frank Skoczyla, Administrator, etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hartford Life Insurance Company, Appellant, 232 vs. Garland S. Johnson, Administrator, etc. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Barton Payne, Agent, etc., et al., Plaintiffs in Error, 222 vs. Industrial Board of Illinois et al. — In Error to the Circuit Court of Coles County, State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from

the Circuit Court of Coles County, State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Keokuk & Hamilton Bridge Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The People of the State of Illinois ex rel. John H. McCallister, County Treasurer, etc. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

228

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cleve Edwards, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Georgia. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

216

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Willard M. Lindsey, Appellant, vs. J. Weston Allen, Attorney General of the State of Massachusetts, et al. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

226

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed

by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. J. Krank Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
888 vs.
Chris H. Pabst et al., a copartnership, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Frank B. Kellogg and Mr. Frank A. Whiteley for the petitioner.

Transportes Maritimos do Estado, Claimant, etc., Petitioner,
775 vs.
Tietjen and Lang Drydock Company;
Transportes Maritimos do Estado, Claimant, etc., Petitioner,
776 vs.
Maxwell Rose, doing business, etc.;
Transportes Maritimos do Estado (in personam), Petitioner,
777 vs.
Maxwell Rose, doing business, etc.;
Transportes Maritimos do Estado, Claimant, etc., Petitioner,
778 vs.
Thomas De Simone; and
Transportes Maritimos do Estado (in personam), Petitioner,
779 vs.
Thomas De Simone.

The motion to dismiss or affirm or to advance was submitted by Mr. E. Curtis Rouse, Mr. John M. Woolsey, Mr. Robert S. Erskine, and Mr. Meyer Kraushaar for the respondents in support of the motion, and by Mr. F. Dudley Kohler for the petitioner in opposition thereto.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, 20, Original. vs. The State of Texas.

On motion of Mr. John S. Flannery in that behalf, the eighth report of the receiver herein was filed.

International Life Insurance Company, Plaintiff in Error, 797 vs. Adrian F. Sherman.

The motion to dismiss or affirm herein was submitted by Mr. John H. Atwood, Mr. Oscar S. Hill, and Mr. William Thomson for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Armwell L. Cooper and Mr. Charles G. Revelle for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Dora E. Rooker et al., Petitioners, 634 vs. Fidelity Trust Company et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William Velpeau Rooker for the petitioner.

The Griscom-Russell Company, Petitioner, 843 vs. Standard Water Systems Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Richard P. Whiteley for the petitioner and by Mr. William M. Stockbridge for the respondent.

William R. Warner & Company, Petitioner, 857 vs. Eli Lilly & Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Francis Rawle, Mr. George W. Wickersham, and Mr. Roger S. Baldwin for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. W. Bradford for the respondent.

Abbott Factory, Inc., Petitioner, 866 vs. Earl Bancroft, as Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Edmund J. Wagar for the petitioner, and by Mr. Percival De Witt Oviatt for the respondent.

John McGovern, Petitioner, 885 vs. The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Seymour Stedman and Mr. Charles H. Soelke for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. George E. Boren for the respondent.

The Keystone Publishing Company, Petitioner,
890 vs.
The Jewelers' Circular Publishing Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. George Carlton Comstock and Mr. Robert C. Beatty for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. Hastings Swenarton for the respondent.

Thomas H. Hayes, Petitioner,
922 vs.
Joseph Chester Gibson, Trustee.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Thomas F. Bayard, Mr. W. Thomas Kemp, and Mr. Robert Pennington for the petitioner, and by Mr. Josiah Marvel for the respondent.

Director General of Railroads, Petitioner,
942 vs.
Samuel Kastenbaum.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Lyman M. Bass for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday, May 15, at 12 o'clock.

Monday, May 15th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that Morris Kamber, Esquire, of New York City, and John Beardsley, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chester J. Gerkin, it is ordered that H. Lawrence Noble, Esquire, of Manila, Philippine Islands, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Ellen S. Mussey, it is ordered that Marion Clark, of Cecilton, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Ernest W. Bradford, it is ordered that Jesse Macbeth, Esquire, of Fort Wayne, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham, it is ordered that J. Prince Webster, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court,

and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. P. Bynum, it is ordered that Edward C. Jerome, Esquire, of Greensboro, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paca Oberlin, it is ordered that James Price Farmer, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John L. Caldwell, it is ordered that Douglas Hudson, Esquire, of Fort Scott, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. Chester Caywood, it is ordered that Merrick Ames Whipple, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John S. Flannery, it is ordered that John Hammond Crabbe, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, it is ordered that B. F. Fowler, Esquire, of Two Harbors, and Joseph Meyer, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Bates, it is ordered that Sylvanus H. Hart, Jr., of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. H. Prince, it is ordered that James F. Wright, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, and John M. Robinson, Esquire, of Charlotte, State of North

Carolina, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Pierce Oil Corporation and Clay Arthur Pierce, Plaintiffs in Error, 172 vs. Phoenix Refining Company. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Paul A. Ewert, Appellant, 173 vs. Carrie Bluejacket, a widow, et al. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

Carrie Bluejacket, a widow, et al., Appellants, 186 vs. Paul A. Ewert.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, on appeal and cross-appeal, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed in part and reversed in part, with costs to be paid by Paul A. Ewert; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma for an accounting and for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

John S. Kendall, Administrator of the Estate of George Redeagle, deceased, et al., Appellants, 157 vs. Paul A. Ewert. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the

United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs ; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Rainier Brewing Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
267 vs.
Great Northern Pacific
Steamship Company.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Union Tool Company,
Petitioner,
152 vs.
Elihu G. Wilson.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Augustus S. Worthington et al., Executors, etc., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The District of Columbia. — In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

268

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The South Covington and Cincinnati Street Railway Company et al., Appellants, vs. The City of Newport, Kentucky. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky.

203

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Brandeis,
Mr. Justice Clarke.
(Mr. Justice Pitney concurs in the result).

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., Appellants, vs. Consolidated Gas Company of New York. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

750

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the

District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed, costs to be paid by appellants with the right to claim credit therefor upon any judgment hereafter entered against them on account of the Master's compensation; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

(Mr. Justice Clarke concurs in the result).

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., Appellants, vs. New York and Queens Gas Company. 751

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed, costs to be paid by appellants with the right to claim credit therefor upon any judgment hereafter entered against them on account of the Master's compensation; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

(Mr. Justice Clarke concurs in the result).

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., Appellants, vs. Central Union Gas Company. 752

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record

from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed in part and affirmed in part, with costs to be taxed against the appellants; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

(Mr. Justice Clarke concurs in the result).

Charles D. Newton, Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., Appellants, 753 vs. Northern Union Gas Company. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed in part and affirmed in part, with costs to be taxed against the appellants; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

(Mr. Justice Clarke concurs in the result).

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., Appellants, 832 vs. The New York Mutual Gas Light Company. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be,

with costs to be taxed against the appellants;
and the same is hereby, reversed in part and affirmed in part, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

(Mr. Justice Clarke concurs in the result).

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., Appellants, vs. The Standard Gas Light Company of the City of New York. 833

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed in part and affirmed in part, with costs to be taxed against the appellants; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

(Mr. Justice Clarke concurs in the result).

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., Appellants, vs. New Amsterdam Gas Company. 844

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed in part and affirmed in part, with costs to be taxed against the appellants; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of

this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

(Mr. Justice Clarke concurs in the result).

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., Appellants, vs. The East River Gas Company of Long Island City. 845 — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed in part and affirmed in part, with costs to be taxed against the appellants; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

(Mr. Justice Clarke concurs in the result).

American Smelting and Refining Company, Appellant, vs. The United States. 221 — Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

John A. Grogan, Collector of Internal Revenue for the First District of Michigan, et al., Appellants,

615 vs.
Hiram Walker & Sons, Limited.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna,
Mr. Justice Day,
Mr. Justice Clarke.

The Anchor Line (Henderson Brothers), Ltd., Appellant,
639 vs.
George W. Aldridge, Collector of Customs for the Port of New York.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna,
Mr. Justice Day,
Mr. Justice Clarke.

British Columbia Mills
Tug & Barge Company, Petitioner,

190 vs.

A. W. Mylroie.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Alaska.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Atherton Mills, Appellant,
16 vs.
Eugene T. Johnston and John W. Johnston, by Eugene T. Johnston, his Prochein Ami.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions to dismiss the bill without costs to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. W. Bailey, Collector of Internal Revenue, Appellant,
590 vs.
John J. George, Trading and doing business as Vivian Cotton Mills, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed

by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions to dismiss the bill.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. W. Bailey and J. W. Bailey, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of North Carolina, Plaintiff in Error,
657 vs.
Drexel Furniture Company.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Clarke.

John Hill, Jr., Reuben G. Chandler, Adolph Kempner, et al., Appellants,
616 vs.
Henry C. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture, David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue of the United States, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this

cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

Alabama Power Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Banks S. Talmadge, as Administrator, etc. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

741

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Transportes Maritimos do Estado, Claimant, etc., Petitioner, vs. Tietjen and Lang Drydock Company.

775

Transportes Maritimos do Estado, Claimant, etc., Petitioner, vs. Maxwell Rose, doing business, etc.

776

Transportes Maritimos do Estado (in personam), Petitioner, vs. Maxwell Rose, doing business, etc.

777

Transportes Maritimos do Estado, Claimant, etc., Petitioner, vs. Thomas De Simone.

778

Transportes Maritimos do Estado, (in personam), Petitioner,

779 vs.

Thomas De Simone.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motions to dismiss or affirm in these cases be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cases on the merits; and that these cases be, and the same are hereby, advanced and assigned for argument on Tuesday, October 3d next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

International Life Insurance Company, Plaintiff in Error,
797 vs.
Adrian P. Sherman.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William R. Warner & Company, Petitioner,
867 vs.
Eli Lilly & Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Director General of Railroads, Petitioner,
942 vs.
Samuel Kastenbaum.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dora E. Booker et al., Petitioners,
634 vs.
Fidelity Trust Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Griscom-Russell Company, Petitioner,
843 vs.
Standard Water Systems Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Abbott Factory, Inc., Petitioner,
866 vs.
Earl Bancroft, as Trustee, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John McGovern, Petitioner,
885 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. J. Krank Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
888 vs.
Chris H. Pabst et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Keystone Publishing Company, Petitioner,
890 vs.
The Jewelers' Circular Publishing Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas H. Hayes, Petitioner,
922 vs.
Joseph Chester Gibson, Trustee, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of New Mexico, Complainant,
19, Orig'l. vs.
The State of Colorado.

On motion of Mr. Edward T. Taylor in behalf of counsel for the defendant, it is now here ordered that the designation of Henry C. Luther of Denver, Colorado, Douglas C. Morgan, of Washington, D. C., and Ethel F. Stevenson, of Santa Fe, New Mexico, as examiners to take testimony in this cause pursuant to the stipulation filed herein on April 27, 1922, be, and the same is hereby approved.

United Shoe Machinery Corporation et al., Appellants,
119 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion for modification of decree herein was submitted by Mr. Charles F. Choate for the appellants, with leave to counsel for the appellee to file reply within ten days.

Toledo Scale Company,

891 vs.
The Computing Scale Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. George D. Welles and Mr. Horace Kent Tenney for the petitioner, and by Mr. John M. Zane, Mr. Charles F. Morse and Mr. Drury W. Cooper for the respondents.

Elmore D. Dier et al., Appellants,
874 vs.
Joab H. Banton, District Attorney of the County of New York, et al.

The motion to advance and for stay herein was submitted by Mr. Nash Rockwood for the appellants. On consideration of the motion for an order continuing the stay herein, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the stay order is continued until May 29th. (Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft)

The suggestions concurring in motion to advance and opposing stay order herein were submitted by Mr. Otto A. Schlobohm in behalf of Mr. Saul S. Myers and Mr. John C. Myers. Leave was granted counsel to file briefs within three days.

The Coca Cola Company, Plaintiff in Error,
873 vs.
The City of Atlanta; and
Empire Cotton Oil Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
892 vs.
The City of Atlanta.

The motion to amend writs of error herein was submitted by Mr. Clifford L. Anderson for the plaintiffs in error.

The Coca Cola Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
873 vs.
The City of Atlanta;
Thomas K. Glenn, Plaintiff in Error,
882 vs.
The City of Atlanta; and
Empire Cotton Oil Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
892 vs.
The City of Atlanta.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein were submitted by Mr. Clifford L. Anderson, Mr. L.Z. Rosser, Mr. L. C. Hopkins and Mr. Harold Hirsch for the plaintiffs in error in support of the petitions, and by Mr. George M. Napier for the respondents.

The Southern Railway Company,
Appellant,
927 vs.
A. D. Watts, as Commissioner of Revenue of North Carolina;
Atlantic & Yadkin Railway Company, Appellant,
928 vs.
A. D. Watts, as Commissioner of Revenue of North Carolina;
Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Appellant,
960 vs.
A. D. Watts, as Commissioner of Revenue of North Carolina;
Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Appellant,
961 vs.
A. D. Watts, as Commissioner of Revenue of North Carolina;
and
Norfolk Southern Railroad Company, Appellant,
962 vs.
A. D. Watts, as Commissioner of Revenue of North Carolina.

The motion for stay pending appeal herein was submitted by Mr. S. R. Prince for the appellants in Nos. 927 and 928, in support of the motion; by Mr. Murray Allen for the appellant in No. 960, in support of the motion; by Mr. Thomas W. Davis for the appellant in No. 961, in support of the motion; and by Mr. W. B. Rodman, Mr. W. B. Rodman, Jr., Mr. C. M. Bain, and Mr. John M. Robinson for the appellant in No. 962, in support of the motion; and by Mr. James S. Manning and Mr. William P. Hynum for the appellees, in opposition thereto.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted by Mr. George H. Brown, Mr. James S. Manning and Mr. William P. Hynum for the appellees.

Leave was granted counsel for appellants to file answer to opposition to motions for stay within three days.

Henry F. Mueller et al., etc., Appellants,
944 vs.
Samuel W. Adler et al.

The motion to advance this case was submitted by Mr. Otto Schlobohm in that behalf.

Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland et al.,
Petitioners,
973 vs.
The Computing Scale Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Charles Markell, Edward Osgood Brown and Edwin J. Marshall for the petitioners, and by Mr. John M. Zane, Mr. Charles F. Morse, and Mr. Drury W. Cooper for the respondents.

John Simmons Company, Petitioner,
57 vs.
The Grier Brothers Company.

The motion to modify decree herein was submitted by Mr. F. S. Maguire in that behalf.

The State of Georgia, Complainant,
16, Original. vs.
The State of South Carolina.

A form of decree in this cause was submitted by Mr. George M. Napier for the complainant.

Bill Moore, Plaintiff in Error,
443 vs.
The State of Georgia.

The motion to advance this case was submitted by Mr. George M. Napier in behalf of counsel for the defendant in error.

Public Utilities Commission of Illinois, etc., et al.,
Appellants,
346 vs.
Illinois Central Railroad Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Bruce Scott in behalf of counsel for the appellants, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Arkansas, Complainant,
--- Original. vs.
The State of Mississippi.

The motion for leave to file bill of complaint herein was submitted by Mr. W. J. Driver in behalf of Mr. J. S. Utley for the complainant.

Dora E. Rooker et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
785 vs.
Fidelity Trust Company et al., etc.

The motion for rule to show cause in re contempt of court and brief in support; petition for supplemental writ of error and assignment of errors, and petition for a supplemental writ of certiorari, with brief in support, were submitted by Mr. William V. Rooker for the plaintiffs in error.

Virginia Huey et al., Plaintiffs in
Error,

870 vs.
D. A. Brock et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. George H. Lamar for the plaintiffs in error in support of the petition.

Henry Vogt Machine Company, Petitioner,
885 vs.
J. C. Allin.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Frank L. Lynch and Mr. Eugene R. Atkisson for the petitioner.

New York Central Railroad Company, Petitioner,
896 vs.
William P. Cooper.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Robert E. Whalen for the petitioner, and by Mr. Alexander G. Bentley for the respondent.

Columbia Railway, Gas & Electric Company, Petitioner,
923 vs.
The State of South Carolina.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Jo-Berry S. Lyles for the petitioner.

Charles H. Morris et al., etc., Petitioners,
938 vs.
Ella Foster.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Lorenzo A. Bailey for the petitioners, and by Nina 1. Thomas for the respondent.

Spring Coal Company et al., Petitioners,
939 vs.
Bethlehem Steel Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Charles C. Buckham for the petitioner, and by Mr. John L. Hall for the respondent.

Mary E. Lawman, Petitioner,
946 vs.
People's Savings & Trust Company of Pittsburgh et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mary E. Lawman, pro se, and by Mr. Thomas Patterson for the respondent.

Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Petitioner,
947 vs.
Gordon A. Ramsay, Administrator, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. James M. Sheean and Mr. George E. Hamilton for the petitioner, and by Mr. David K. Tone for the respondent.

Samuel Lumiere, Petitioner,
948 vs.
Robertson-Cole Distributing Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Ernie Adameon for the petitioner, and by Mr. Francis G. Caffey for the respondent.

Thomas J. Taylor et al., partners, etc., Petitioners,
949 vs.
Louisville Soap Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Edmund F. Trabue, Mr. John C. Doolan and Mr. Thomas K. Helm for the petitioners, and by Mr. Alex. Pope Humphrey and Mr. Edward Porter Humphrey for the respondent.

Buntaro Kaneda, Petitioner,
951 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Annette Abbott Adams for the petitioner.

Maru Navigation Company, Owner of the Steamer St. Charles, et al., Petitioners,
952 vs.
Societa Commerciale Italiana di Navigazione.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Homer L. Loomis for the petitioners, and by Mr. John C. Prizer for the respondent.

James H. Alderman et al., Petitioners,
955 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. W. D. Bell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. George E. Boren for the respondent.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner,
959 vs.
Industrial Commission of the State of Illinois et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Lindorf O. Whitnel and Mr. Edward J. White for the petitioner.

Delaware Steamship & Commerce Corporation, Petitioner,
963 vs.
New England Coal & Coke Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Nelson B. Cramer and Mr. T. K. Schmuck for the petitioner, and Mr. Emory H. Buckner for the respondent.

St. Johns N. F. Shipping Corporation, Owner, etc., Petitioner,
968 vs.
S. A. Companhia Geral Commercial do Rio de Janeiro.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Clarence Bishop Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. Curtis Rouse for the respondent.

James C. Davis, Director General, etc., Plaintiff in Error,
327 vs.
J. J. Smith, Jr., Administrator, etc.

The motion to dismiss or affirm herein was submitted by Mr. Marion W. Reiley for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Monte M. Lemann, Mr. L. E. Jeffries, Mr. S. R. Prince, and Mr. H. O'B. Cooper for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, May 29, at 12 o'clock.

Monday, May 29th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph H. Gaines, it is ordered that Charles S. Dice, Esquire, of Lewisburg; and Morgan Owen, Esquire, Edwin B. Dyer, Esquire, and Staige Davis, Esquire, of Charleston, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John C. Myers, it is ordered that Louis S. Posner, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William A. Oldfield, it is ordered that Gertrude Dale, of Nashville, State of Tennessee; Isabel Klein, of Fort Smith, State of Arkansas; Charles M. Layne, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and W. J. Lanier, Esquire, of Forrest City, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roscoe C. Patterson, it is ordered that Charles J. Wright, Esquire, of Springfield, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, it is ordered that Robert Boone McMillan, Esquire, of San

Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, it is ordered that Ernest L. Hall, Esquire, of Beaumont, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Aubrey B. Fennell, it is ordered that HillesHamilton, Esquire, of Grandfield, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harvey D. Jacob, it is ordered that LeRoy P. Percy, Esquire, of Birmingham, State of Alabama; Joseph R. Gibson, Esquire, J. Arthur Adams, Esquire, and George Edwin Adams, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and James B. Henney, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis Rawle, it is ordered that Joseph W. Henderson, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Philip Berg, it is ordered that Barnett Eugene Kopelman, Esquire, of New York City, and Joseph G. M.Browne, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Benjamin S. Minor, it is ordered that Frank D. Moore, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Albert M. Hartung, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas L. Blanton, it is ordered that Sam McCollum, Esquire, of Brady, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fritz G. Lanham, it is ordered that L. M. Ballowe, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Cox, it is ordered that Clarence E. Fleming, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hoke Smith, it is ordered that E. J. Reagan, Esquire, of McDonough, and Frank Reagan, Esquire, of Macon, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick W. Dallinger, it is ordered that Austin M. Pinkham, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. F. H. Ogilby, it is ordered that Daniel Miner, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William M. Williams, it is ordered that Benjamin P. DeWitt, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roger Shale, it is ordered that William J. Morgan, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, it is ordered that Harold H. Emmons, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The City of Houston, Appellant,

Southwestern Bell Telephone Company. Appeals from the District Court of the
Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, Appellant, United States for the Southern District
220 vs. of Texas.
The City of Houston.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas, on appeal and cross-appeal, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed, each appellant to pay the costs on its appeal.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

(Mr. Justice Brandeis took no part in the consideration or decision of this case)

The United States of America
ex relations John W. French, In Error to the Court of Appeals of the
Plaintiff in Error, District of Columbia.
724 vs.
John W. Weeks, Secretary of
War.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

The United States of America
ex relations William F. In Error to the Court of Appeals of the
Creary, Plaintiff in Error, District of Columbia.
725 vs.
John W. Weeks, Secretary of
War.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjuged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Ng Fung Ho, Otherwise known as Ung Kip, Ng Yuen Shew, Gin Sang Get, and Gin Sang Mo, Petitioners, vs. Edward White, as Commissioner of Immigration for the Port of San Francisco. 176

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed in part and reversed in part, costs in this Court to be paid by Ng Fung Ho and Ng Yuen Shew; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Great Northern Railway Company and John Barton Payne, Director General of Railroads, Petitioners, vs. Merchants Elevator Company. 202

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland, Appellant,

207 vs.

The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims with directions to make new findings of fact as prayed and modify the judgment, if need be, to conform to the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Fidelity Title & Trust Company, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Appellant, Appeal from the Court of Claims.

208 vs.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Charles Glen Collins, Appellant,

672 vs. Appeal from the District Court of the

Victor Loisel, United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Louisiana. United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Carlisle Packing Company,

Petitioner,

195 vs.

Ole Sandanger.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Concurring:
Mr. Justice Clarke.

Charles Olin, Appellant,
246 vs.
Perry Kitzmiller, R. C. Clanton, Carl Shoemaker, et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The State Industrial Commission of the State of New York, Petitioner,
625 vs.
Nordenholt Corporation and the Travelers Insurance Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Joshua W. Miles, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Maryland,
Plaintiff in Error,

416 vs.

The Safe Deposit & Trust Company of Baltimore, Guardian of Frank R. Brown. — In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

The United States of America, Appellant, — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Utah.

5 vs.

Southern Pacific Company et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Utah, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna.
(Mr. Justice McReynolds and Mr. Justice Brandeis took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

Pine Hill Coal Company, Inc., Appellant, — Appeal from the Court of Claims.

101 vs.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this

Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Morrisdale Coal Company,
Appellant,
65 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Santa Fe Pacific Railroad Company,
Appellant,
108 vs.
John Barton Payne, Secretary of the Interior.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Santa Fe Pacific Railroad Company,
Appellant,
109 vs.
John Barton Payne, Secretary of the Interior.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the

same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Federal Baseball Club of Baltimore, Incorporated, Plaintiff in Error,
204 vs.
The National League of Professional Baseball Clubs, National Exhibition Company, The Brooklyn Ball Club, et al.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York, Plaintiff in Error,
215 vs.
Mary S. Liebing.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California and O. J. Burton, Petitioners,
224 vs.
John Barton Payne, as Agent, etc., (Los Angeles & Salt Lake Railway Company).

On writ of certiorari to the District Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Two, of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from

the District Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division 2, of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court of Appeal in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court of Appeal for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Continental Insurance Company and Fidelity-Phenix Fire Insurance Company of New York, Appellants,
609 vs.
The United States of America, Reading Company, The Philadelphia and Reading Coal & Iron Company, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court, and, as so modified, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

(Mr. Justice Brandeis took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

Seward Prosser, Mortimer N. Buckner, and John H. Mason, as a Committee Representing Holders of Common Stock of the Reading Company,
Appellants,
610 vs.
The United States of America, Reading Company, Philadelphia and Reading Coal & Iron Company et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court, and, as so modified, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

(Mr. Justice Brandeis took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

United Shoe Machinery Corporation et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America. 119

The United Shoe Machinery Corporation and others, appellants, having presented their application for rehearing and modification of the decree of affirmance heretofore rendered in this cause, upon consideration thereof, the same is overruled.

It is ordered that the District Court after the receipt of the mandate of affirmance may hear an application of the appellants for an extension of time in which to readjust the business of the United Shoe Machinery Corporation with its lessees, and, if satisfied that the same is necessary, may grant a time, not exceeding three months from the date of the receipt of the mandate, in which the United Shoe Machinery Corporation may adjust its business with lessees in a manner to comply with the decree of this Court affirming the decree of the District Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Simmons Company, Petitioner, vs. The Grier Brothers Company. 57

On consideration of the motion to modify the decree heretofore entered in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Coca Cola Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of Atlanta. 873

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Empire Cotton Oil Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
892 vs.
The City of Atlanta.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Various Railroad Companies,
Appellants,
927, 928, 960, 961, 962. vs.
A. D. Watts, Commissioner of Revenue of North Carolina.

Appeals from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of North Carolina.

Per Curiam: In these cases, which were suits brought under section 266, Judicial Code, as amended by the Act of March 4, 1913, (37 Stat. 1013), for a preliminary and permanent injunction, a preliminary injunction was denied by the District Court and a stay granted until an application could be made to this court. As the District Court is familiar with the character of the case, and we are not, we deny the motion for a stay, with leave to apply to the District Court for a stay until the matter can be disposed of here, if in its judgment, it deem that such a stay should be granted.

The motion to advance is granted and the cases set for hearing on the first Monday in November.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Arkansas, Complainant,
--- Original. vs.
The State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file bill of complaint in this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and that process issue returnable on Monday, October 2d, 1922.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dora E. Rooker et al.,
Petitioners,
634 vs.
Fidelity Trust Company et al., etc.
Dora E. Rooker et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,

785 vs.
Fidelity Trust Company
et al., etc.

On consideration of the motion for a rule to show cause, of the petition for a supplemental writ of error, and of the petition for a supplemental writ of certiorari, in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion and petitions be, and the same are hereby, severally denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads,
Plaintiff in Error,
327 vs.
J. J. Smith, administrator, etc.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Elmore D. Dier et al.,
Appellants,
874 vs.
Joab H. Banton, District Attorney, etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance and for a stay herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry P. Mueller et al., etc., Appellants,
944 vs.
Samuel W. Adler et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Bill Moore, Plaintiff in Error,
443 vs.
The State of Georgia.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 23, 1922.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Toledo Scale Company,
Petitioner,
891 vs.
The Computing Scale Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland et al., Petitioners,
973 vs.
The Computing Scale Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

St. Johns N. F. Shipping Corporation, Petitioner,
968 vs.
South America Companhia Geral Commercial do Rio de Janeiro.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Virginia Huey et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
870 vs.
D. A. Brock et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas K. Glenn,
Plaintiff in Error,
882 vs.
The City of Atlanta.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same

The Coca Cola Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
873 vs.
The City of Atlanta.

On consideration of the motion to amend the writ of error in this cause,
it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Empire Cotton Oil Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
892 vs.
The City of Atlanta.

On consideration of the motion to amend the writ of error in this cause,
it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry Vogt Machine Company,
Petitioner,
883 vs.
J. C. Allin.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Central Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
896 vs.
William P. Cooper.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Columbia Railway, Gas & Electric Company,
Petitioner,
923 vs.
The State of South Carolina.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and of the argument of

counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles H. Morris et al., etc., Petitioner,
938 vs.
Ella Foster.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Spring Coal Company et al., Petitioners,
939 vs.
Bethlehem Steel Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mary E. Lawman, Petitioner,
946 vs.
People's Savings & Trust Company of Pittsburgh et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Petitioner,
947 vs.
Gordon A. Ramsay, Administrator, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the

Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel Lumiere,
Petitioner,
948 vs.
Robertson-Cole Distributing Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas J. Taylor et al.,
Partners, etc.,
Petitioners,
949 vs.
Louisville Soap Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Buntaro Kaneda, Petitioner,
951 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Maru Navigation Company, Owner, etc., et al., Petitioners,
952 vs.
Societa Commerciale Italiana di Navigazione.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James H. Alderman et al., Petitioners,
955 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner,
959 vs.
Industrial Commission of the State of Illinois et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Circuit Court of Alexander County, State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Circuit Court of Alexander County, State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Delaware Steamship & Commerce Corporation, Petitioner,
963 vs.
New England Coal & Coke Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the

United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Albert B. Fall, Secretary of the Interior,
Plaintiff in Error,
205 vs.
The United States of America on the relation of W. T. Mosier et al.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be restored to the docket for reargument at the next term.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sonneborn Brothers, etc.,
Appellants,
191 vs.
Walter A. Keeling, Attorney General.

It is ordered by this Court that this cause be restored to the docket for reargument at the next term.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The court will adjourn for the term on Monday, June 5 next.

August V. Anderson, Warden of the U. S. Penitentiary, Leavenworth, Kansas,
Petitioner,
972 vs.
Arthur Corall.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Blackburn Esterline in behalf of Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. William C. Herron for the petitioner.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,
998 vs.
George Remus et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the plaintiff in error.

Wallace Benedict, as Receiver, etc., Petitioner,
994 vs.
Aaron Ratner.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John A. Kratz in behalf of Mr. Selden Bacon for the petitioner, and by Mr. Louis S. Posner for the respondent.

William E. Woodbridge, Appellant,
887 vs.
The United States.

The motion to reinstate was submitted by Mr. Rufus S. Day for the appellant.

The State of New York,
Complainant,
--- Original. vs.
Harry M. Daugherty, Attorney General, et al.

The motion for leave to file bill of complaint herein was submitted by Mr. Elon R. Brown for the complainant.

Henry P. Reed et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
854 vs.
Village of Hibbing et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. H. V. Mercer for the plaintiffs in error in support of the petition, with leave to file printed record hereafter, and by Mr. C. A. Severance, Mr. George W. Morgan, and Mr. H. B. Fryberger for the defendants in error.

The Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway et al.,
Appellants,
988 vs.
The State of Tennessee et al., etc.

The motion for a stay herein was submitted by Mr. Fitzgerald Hall, Mr. Charles N. Burch, and Mr. John B. Keeble for the appellants in support of the motion, and by Mr. Frank M. Thompson and Mr. William H. Swiggart, Jr., for the appellees in opposition thereto.

Buell V. Stevens, Plaintiff in Error,
401 vs.
Southern Pacific Land Company;
Ralph E. Stevens, as Administrator, etc., Plaintiff in Error,
402 vs.
Southern Pacific Land Company; and
Mary V. Beggs, Plaintiff in Error,
403 vs.
Southern Pacific Land Company.

The motion to dismiss or affirm was submitted by Mr. C. F. R. Ogilby and Mr. Frank Thunen for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Daniel N. Clark and Mr. William L. Chitty for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Fox Film Corporation, Petitioner,
825 and 826. vs.
Frederick M. Knowles et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Otto Schlobohm in behalf of counsel for the petitioner.

William R. Warner & Company,
Petitioner,
857 vs.
Eli Lilly & Company.

The motion for supersedeas herein was submitted by Mr. Francis Rawle for the petitioner in support of the motion, and by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for the respondent in opposition thereto.

The State of Wisconsin,
Complainant,
--- Original. vs.
The State of Illinois.

The motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein was submitted by Mr. William J. Morgan for the complainant.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania,
Complainant,
17, Original. vs.
The State of West Virginia;
and
The State of Ohio, Complainant,
18, Original. vs.
The State of West Virginia.

The motion for an order fixing compensation of the Commissioner herein was submitted by Mr. Levi Cooke in that behalf.

Arkansas Anthracite Coal & Land Company, Petitioner,
894 vs.
Mary A. Stokes.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. James B. McDonough for the petitioner.

Arkansas Anthracite Coal & Land Company, Petitioner,
895 vs.
Fremont Stokes.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. James B. McDonough for the petitioner.

J. L. Lancaster et al., Receivers of the Texas & Pacific Railway, Petitioners,
897 vs.
Mrs. Clara Allen, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. F. H. Prendergast for the petitioners, and by Mr. S.P. Jones for the respondent.

Emma C. Bergdoll et al.,
Petitioners,
933 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John S. Maxwell for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. William C. Herron for

the respondent.

Charles A. Brawn et al., Petitioners,
934 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John S. Maxwell for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. William C. Herron for the respondent.

Charles A. Brawn et al., Petitioners,
935 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John S. Maxwell for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. William C. Herron for the respondent.

Emma C. Bergdoll et al., Petitioners,
936 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John S. Maxwell for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. William C. Herron for the respondent.

James E. Romig, Petitioner,
937 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John S. Maxwell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. William C. Herron for the respondent.

Henry W. Perry et al., Trustees, etc., Petitioners,
940 vs.
The Para Rubber Company of Pennsylvania.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Lowrie C. Barton for the petitioners, and by Mr. E. Lowry Humes and Mr. Leonard K. Guiler for the respondent.

Public Service Railway Company, Petitioner,
941 vs.
Harold Wursthorn, an Infant, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Frank Bergen for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edwin F. Smith for the respondent.

Barney Little, Petitioner,
950 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Charles M. Hay for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Douglas Newton, Petitioner,
956 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Maynard P. Stiles for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. George E. Boren for the respondent.

Robins Drydock & Repair Company, Petitioner,
958 vs.
Pan American Petroleum & Transport Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. T. Catesby Jones for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles C. Burlingham and Mr. Ray Rood Allen for the respondent.

David H. Riddle, Petitioner,
964 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Henry E. Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Baltimore Talking Board Company, Petitioner,
966 vs.
Joshua W. Miles, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Alexander Armstrong for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. George E. Boren for the respondent.

Patterson-Sargent Company, Inc., Petitioner,
967 vs.
H. H. Rumble et al., Trustees, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John S. Wise, Jr., for the petitioner.

The People of Porto Rico, Petitioner,
969 vs.
Fortuna Estates et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. C. T. Trent and Mr. Logan W. Rock for the petitioner, and by Mr. Francis E. Meagle for the respondents.

Hon. Harland B. Howe, District Judge, etc., Petitioner,
970 vs.

United States Circuit Court of
Appeals for the Second Circuit .

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Charles Hershenstein for the petitioner.

Gillette Safety Razor Company, Petitioner,
979 vs.
James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Eugene M. Schwarzenberg for the petitioner, and by Mr. Austin M. Pinkham for the respondant.

Al Vesely, Petitioner,
982 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. L. E. Dadman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt and Mr. George E. Boren for the respondent.

Tom Tierney, Petitioner,
983 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. J. H. Gaines for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. George E. Boren for the respondant.

Harvey Laundry Company & Refinite Company, Petitioner,
984 vs.
The Permutit Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Edward P. Colladay, Mr. D. P. Wolhaupter, and Mr. William J. Hughes for the petitioner, and by Mr. James Q. Rice for the respondent.

The Danish Pride Milk Products Company, Petitioner,
985 vs.
Paul Stuppel, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William G. Wheeler for the petitioner.

Ford Motor Company, Petitioner,
986 vs.
Hotel Woodward Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. John W. Davis, Mr. Alfred Lucking, Mr. DeLancey Nicoll, Mr. William J. Hughes, and Mr. H. H. Emmons for the petitioner, and by Mr. Stephen C. Baldwin and Mr. Charles H. Tuttle for the respondent.

The Pennsylvania Railroad
Company, Petitioner,

987 vs.
John P. Pugh.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney and Mr. John Spalding Flannery for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hamilton Ward for the respondent.

The New Orleans Land Company, Petitioner,
989 vs.
Robert B. Brott et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Charles Louque for the petitioner.

The Rocky Mountain Fuel Company, Petitioner,
990 vs.
The Consolidated Coal & Coke Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Jesse G. Northcutt and Mr. Henry E. Lutz for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles W. Waterman for the respondent.

Charleston & Western Carolina Railway Company, Petitioner,
996 vs.
John Williams.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Henry E. Davis and Mr. F. B. Grier for the petitioner, and by Mr. Benjamin B. McCowen for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, June 5 next, at 12 o'clock.

Monday, June 5th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
John H. Clarke,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, it is ordered that Miss Marion H. Drake and Henry K. Urion, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf byMr. Assistant Attorney General Lovett, it is ordered that Herbert A. Horgan, Esquire, of Brookline, and Harry C. Silver, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Goff, it is ordered that David A. Hart, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor or this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Morganston, it is ordered that Horace Philip Hefferman, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State or Minnesota, and John Nelson Torvestad, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George M. Morris, it is ordered that Benjamin M. Stout, Esquire, of Chicago, State of

Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Byrnes, it is ordered that Francis Marion Purifoy, Esquire, of Montgomery, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John F. Miller, it is ordered that C. Dell Floyd, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fritz G. Lanham, it is ordered that Joel F. Watson, Esquire, of Mt.Vernon, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roger O'Donnell, it is ordered that Kazis Krauczunas, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank K. Nebeker, it is ordered that Burton W. Musser, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard P. Whiteley, it is ordered that Wilson F. McCray, Esquire, and Henry W. Driscoll, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham, it is ordered that Michael A. Musmanno, Esquire, of McKees Rocks, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, it is ordered that Israel G. Holender, Esquire, of Buffalo,

State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that Andrew D. Collins, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Homan W. Walsh, it is ordered that Garland M. McNutt, Esquire, of Charlottesville, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David G. Stember, it is ordered that Raymond E. Werner, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Carr, it is ordered that George L. Hoodenpyl, Esquire, of Long Beach, and Charles Robert McCarty, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Ernest Lipke, Appellant,	Appeal from the District Court of the
596 vs.	United States for the Eastern District
Ephraim Lederer, Collector of	of Pennsylvania.
Internal Revenue for the First	
District of Pennsylvania.	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:

Ward and Gow, Plaintiff in Error,
345 vs.
Himan Krinsky and State Industrial Commission.

In Error to the Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Third Judicial Department, of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Third Judicial Department, of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds,
Mr. Justice McKenna.

Prudential Insurance Company of America, Plaintiff in Error,
149 vs.
Robert T. Cheek.

In Error to the St. Louis Court of Appeals, State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the St. Louis Court of Appeals, State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Dissenting:
Mr. Chief Justice Taft,
Mr. Justice Van Devanter,
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
19 vs.
Daniel J. Perry.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Dissenting:

Mr. Chief Justice Taft,

Mr. Justice Van Devanter,

Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The State of Wyoming, Complainant,
vs.
The State of Colorado, the Greeley-Poudre Irrigation District, and the Laramie-Poudre Reservoirs and Irrigation Company.

3, Original.

Final decree, June 5, 1922.

This cause having been heretofore submitted on the pleadings and the evidence taken before and reported by the commissioners appointed for the purpose, and the Court being now fully advised in the premises:

It is considered, ordered and decreed that the defendants, their officers, agents and servants, be, and they are hereby, severally enjoined from diverting or taking from the Laramie River and its tributaries in the State of Colorado more than fifteen thousand five hundred (15,500) acre-feet of water per annum in virtue of or through what is designated in the pleadings and evidence as the Laramie-Poudre Tunnel appropriation in that State,

Provided, that this decree shall not prejudice the right of the State of Colorado, or of any one recognized by her as duly entitled thereto, to continue to exercise the right now existing and hereby recognized to divert and take from such stream and its tributaries in that State eighteen thousand (18,000) acre-feet of water per annum in virtue of and through what is designated in the pleadings and evidence as the Skyline Ditch appropriation in that State; nor prejudice the right of that State, or of any one recognized by her as duly entitled thereto, to continue to exercise the right now existing and hereby recognized to divert and take from such stream and its tributaries in that State four thousand two hundred and fifty (4,250) acre-feet of water per annum in virtue of and through the meadow-land appropriations in that State which are named in the pleadings and evidence; nor prejudice or affect the right of the State of Colorado or the State of Wyoming, or of any one recognized by either State as duly entitled thereto, to continue to exercise the right to divert and use water from Sand Creek, sometimes spoken of as a tributary of the Laramie River, in virtue of any existing and lawful appropriation of the waters of such creek;

And it is also considered, ordered and decreed that the State of Wyoming do have and recover from the defendants her lawful costs herein.

And it is further considered, ordered and decreed that the clerk of this Court do transmit to the chief magistrates of the States of Colorado and Wyoming copies of this decree duly authenticated under the seal of this Court.

Adelbert A. Weiland, as State Engineer of the State of Colorado, et al., Appellants,
3 vs.
The Pioneer Irrigation Company.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Colorado.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke.

Harley-Davidson Motor Company et al.,
Petitioners,
26,Original. vs.
The Honorable Joseph Buffington et al., etc.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of mandamus herein, the return to the rule to show cause, and the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that a writ of mandamus be awarded requiring the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit to decide the appeal presented.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United Mine Workers of America et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
31 vs.
Coronado Coal Company et al.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the

United States for the Western District of Arkansas for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United Mine Workers of America et al., Petitioners, vs. Coronado Coal Company et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

State of Oklahoma, Plaintiff, vs. State of Texas, Defendant, United States of America, Intervener. — No. 20, Original.

Partial decree, June 5, 1922.

Certain issues in this cause involving proprietary claims to the bed of Red River having been heretofore submitted on the pleadings, various petitions of intervention and the evidence taken before and reported by a commissioner, and the Court having considered those issues and announced its conclusions thereon in an opinion delivered May 1, 1922:

It is considered, ordered and decreed as follows:

1. That Red River is not a navigable stream in any part of its course within the State of Oklahoma.

2. That the State of Oklahoma did not in virtue of her admission into the Union as a State acquire any title to, or become the owner of, the bed of the part of Red River within her borders.

3. That the State of Oklahoma has no title, right or interest in or to the part of the bed of Red River within her borders, save such as is incidental to her ownership of lands on the northerly bank of the river.

4. That the intervener D. D. Brunson, who claims rights in the bed of Red River in virtue of certain oil and gas leases granted by the State of Oklahoma and her officers, did not acquire and does not hold any right whatever in such river bed under those leases or any of them, and that the said leases have been at all times void and of no force or effect.

5. That the portion of the bed of Red River which formerly was within what was known and designated as Kiowa, Comanche and Apache Pasture Reserve Number One (commonly called the Big Pasture), and the portion of the bed of Red River which lies south of what formerly was known and designated as such pasture re-

serve, has not at any time been subject to location or acquisition under the mining laws of the United States.

6. That the several interveners hereafter named in this paragraph, who are asserting rights in the portions of the bed of Red River named in the last preceding paragraph in virtue of mining locations claimed to have been made under the mining laws of the United States, did not acquire and do not hold any right whatever in such river bed under those mining locations or any of them, and that the said mining locations have been at all times void and of no force or effect. The said interveners are as follows:

Burk Divide Oil Company, No. 2, a corporation: Benjamin H. Goddin, William Dee Hammonds, Robert R. Lavender, Robert H. Woodruff, Claude C. Lear, Ralph L. Winchell, Luther H. Hammonds, Charlie L. Mount.

Burk Divide Oil Company, No. 3, a corporation: Francis M. Crane, Joseph C. Eversole, L. M. Varner, Abner Eversole, Marvin W. Tindle, O. W. Crane, Columbus R. Atchley, Charlie F. Crane.

Burk Divide Oil Company, a corporation, Walter C. Daugherty, James L. Taylor, Evander Kaiser, Floyd N. Thompson, Robert L. Hart, A. C. Goddin, Thomas R. Foster, James B. Crossland, Judsonia Developing Association.

Burk Divide Oil Company (Consolidated), a corporation.

Pacific-Wyoming Oil Co., a corporation: H. L. Roberts, H. R. King, W. F. Long, Albert L. Peters, J. C. Brown, R. E. Litton, H. H. Overton, Jim Hyde.

J. H. Sharrock, Roy Sharrock, Earl Fuller, Robert E. Kent, T. D. Hamill, T. A. Hammill, Charles H. Martin, Charles H. Slack.

Frank Sharrock, Charles H. Murphey, R. O. Hammill, Caleb B. Bledsoe, M. Harve Foshee, Edna Sharrock, Lovie R. Lear, George Bradfield, C. O. Keeley, ——— Ellis, ——— Lambert, Lambert & Ellis (partnership).

Lena H. Slack, Louie L. Varner, Lena Hammill, Sarah E. Davis, Gertrude Hamill, Lena N. Kent, Eva C. Wilson, Jennie Hamill.

Alva A. Varner, Wm. T. Davis, Earl N. Walford, F. C. Hamill, John R. Slack, Ollie M. Sharp, Riley I. Davy, George W. Hamill.

William M. Patterson, William G. Trigg, Melville E. Peters, Interstate-Texas Oil Company (a corporation), Belmont Oil Company (joint-stock association), Melish Consolidated Placer Oil Mining Association, Hazel Burk Oil Company, a joint-stock association, R. F. Henderson, trustee, Delta Oil Company, J. B. Lawton, Carl C. Staley, Eugene H. Smith, D. V. Burrell, W. L. Boyd, W. M. Egbert, Clarence Brashear, R. L. Brown, James H. Shaw, Alfred A. Brashear, Oscar W. Rhodes, George J. Lackey, W. M. Egbert, Mark Benson.

Ava Willis, A. F. Anderson, Jorgen Jorgensen, George M. Coffman, Tracey L. Coffman, Edwin Sundgren, Mark Denson, Walter V. Burchett, Eugene Smith, H. C. Pollock, J. L. Ellsworth, C. S. Govereau, S. C. George, O. J. Baxter, H. G. Pollock, C. B. Govereau, John Reckert, Flora E. Billingsley, G. N. Coffman, Eugene H. Smith, Smolen T. Brashear, M. C. Coffman, W. L. Brown.

Buckeye Petroleum Company, South West Petroleum Company, Delta Oil Company, H. N. Brennan, H. B. Cobb, W. E. Bishop, W. J. Steward, J. W. Akin, W. L. Brashears, R. O. Kenley, Langford Oil & Development Company, Aldine Oil Corporation.

Agriculture Aid Association: James S. Fulton, Green B. Wolfe, Noble A. Gordon, Isaac D. Settle, Mattie Pool, Hoyt N. Berryman, Charles L. McGuire, John Robert Gillam, W. T. Adams.

Oregon Mining Company: John F. Watson, H. K. Maxwell, George A. Fitzimmons, John B. Blocher, Anna B. Wright, Frances M. Wright, Jake Hamon.

AAA—1 Placer Mining Association: Smith S. Fryar, Thomas H. Gilliland, Rawleigh L. Robertson, David N. Downing, Tilden H. White, George H. Willis, Alvin A. Wells.

AABA Placer Mining Association: Harry A. Markham, Howard V. Hinckley, Wm. F. Schoenhoven, Herbert L. McCracken, Orren Harden Deel, Frank M. English, James A. Collier, Harold Wallace.

Amalgamated Assets Association: Aultman B. Swaim, Tarlton M. Brock, Ira C. Cribbs, Billie Jones, George M. Sharrock, Ralph V. Widman, Gos Owens.

Airplane Arts Association: Joseph F. Hamilton, Thomas R. Carl, John W. Kukuk, Duncan M. Circle, Lewis Butler, Jed P. Owens, Jules S. Cormier.

All American Association: P. S. McGuire, Samuel J. Meals, Alonzo R. Poyer, Melvin S. Poyer, Arthur Heatherly, Charles C. Crump, Alin G. Huffhines.

All Argosies Association: T. H. Ware, R. M. Cowan, Fred De Vinna, Clarence Fink, Myrtle A. McGuire, Roy Evans, N. Douglas, Seymour S. Price.

Aspen Attorney Association: Henry E. Asp, Andrew J. Key, Wm. J. Carter, William Wilson, Christina M. Gordon.

Sons of Thor Mining Association: Lillian Gilstrap, Josie L. Owen, James A. Embry.

All Around Association.

Arkansas Placer Oil Mining Company: Marion N. Addison, Daniel L. Hannifin, James M. Patterson, William M. Addison, Ruth Flanagan, Lucile Heston, Beulah Falk.

Good Luck Oil Mining Company: George W. Potter, Thomas A. Ikerd, Eddie S. Traylor, Jeff D. Trigg, Jess R. Short.

Rain Water Oil Mining Association: Millie A. Trigg, Nettie Harden, Edward Lee Frye, C. B. Gamill, Katie Gamill, B. L. Stephens, Bertha Stephens.

Belmont Placer Oil Mining Company: Stephen P. Hannifin, Zac T. Trigg, Grover Addison, Nelson Emery.

Whale Oil Company: Arthur J. Emery, Benita Moorhead, Rhea Moore, Cloney A. Smith.

Goat Island Association No. 1: John M. Bender, H. Clay Dykes, W. O. Tarr, T. W. McGraw, H. A. Pendleton, Tom Isbell, Tom A. Upshaw, T. F. Ragsdale.

Goat Island Association No. 2: Robert S. Ragsdale, Dave Thorne, Ed. D. Heine, W. Roy Hill, W. D. Utts, C. L. Mayes, A. M. Miller, W. H. Miller.

American Aces Association: Fred Ptak, F. H. Wall, Clarence L. Henley, Robert P. Carpenter, Adolph Honegger, William F. Caldwell.

Double Triangle Petroleum Development Association, Big Chief Petroleum Development Association, Mid River Petroleum Development Association, Submarine Petroleum Development Association, Sand Bar Petroleum Development Association, River Bend Petroleum Development Association, Big Eight Petroleum Development Association, Meander Petroleum Development Association, Half Island Petroleum Development Association, Blue Goose Petroleum Development Association, Albert Bissell, Nathan Ulrich, F. D. Ross, William H. Drybread, Mortie McDaniel, Frank Swartie, Margaret Owen Read, Lulu Truitt, Casper S. Ulrich, Allen Fields, Bruce P. Fields, J. F. Erwin, Mary Patterson, J. A. Diffendaffer, Illie Johns, J. A. Staily, Charles Payne, E. R. Kerby, A. J. Grimes, E. O. Hadley, J. Anthony, George Pugh, H. B. Eller, T. E. Kendrick, E. Ulrich, L. L. Cole, W. E. Pannell, John Vosburg, Nannie Kimberly, John E. Wilson, H. C. Smith, Harry Williams, Mary Manes, Lou Cunningham, J. L. Pope, H. D. Ashley, John W. Hammond, William Zea, John T. Fields, Hamilton Morgan, Raymond Fields, Mrs. P. Little, J. C. Hagan, Alex Walker, Jerry Sparling, John T. Orin, Sam Madox, Perrie Dennas, Clyde Owen, Rondo Stevens, Lafe Owen, L. W. Hurley, O. D. Day, Lulu Hall, George Frampton, James W. Hues, A. C. Kendrick, J. G. Andrews, John F. Mieling, Etta Seay, C. S. Chumn, G. M. Burkhart, B. Bissell, Ned Shepler, Joe Altman, F. C. McCarthy, M. M. White, George W. Rogers, W. P. Danford, Thomas Green, Albert Mitschrich, Nettie Ulrich, Laura Fields, E. Chester Ecker, Charles Field, Guy Ulrich, J. T. Smith, Maggie Wilson, Oscar Pope, Francis M. John, jr., John M. Shanklin, A. B. March, I. F. Collie, Burkburnett Placer Mining & Oil Company (a corporation).

Melish Consolidated Placer Oil Mining Association: Elsie E. Wright, O. J. Logan, John Stuard, C. H. Hyde, George Brown, B. F. VanDyke, Sam Finley, W. B. Skirvin, L. A. Klinkenbeard, A. S. Thomas, P. F. Slaton, E. H. Howell, Nestor Rummons, A. F. Schwartz, M. L. Whelan, F. R. Quimby, Frank Nevills, A. N. McKinney, Joe Huber, Truitt Johnson, Tom Testerman, Ray Tester-

man, Joe Clark, W. B. Cuppy, Scotty Vinson, James Byran, A. C. Seives, Marvin Spears, P. W. Beamer, G. M. Brown, W. A. Bennett, Warren K. Snyder, I. B. Levy, F. L. Nevills, Cam Galt, H. C. Enoch, J. B. Doolin, E. A. Haines, Ruby Turner, Ira E. Gaskill, J. B. Lansden, J. H. Windle, D. H. Pernhall, S. H. Harris, O. E. Heatherington, F. P. Duncan, J. H. Cline, J. Garnett Hughes, Lucy Lacy.

7. That the petitions of intervention based on the oil and gas leases named in paragraph four (4) hereof and the petitions of intervention based on the mining locations named in paragraph six (6) hereof are hereby severally dismissed on their merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William E. Woodbridge, Appellant, 887 vs. The United States. — On consideration of the motion to rescind order docketing and dismissing this case, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of New York, Complainant, --- Original. vs. Harry M. Daugherty, Attorney General, et al. — On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and process is ordered to issue returnable on Monday, October 2d, 1922.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Wisconsin, Complainant, --- Original. vs. The State of Illinois. — On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and process is ordered to issue returnable on Monday, October 2, 1922.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Georgia, Complainant, 16, Original. vs. The State of South Carolina. — This cause came on to be heard by this Court, and, for the purpose of carrying into effect the conclusions of the Court as stated in its opinion herein, It is ordered, adjudged, and decreed that the boundary between the States of Georgia and South Carolina is and shall be the rivers Savannah, Tugaloo and Chattooga to the point where the latter river touches the North Carolina line at the thirty-fifth parallel of

North latitude; and the location of the boundary line between said States is hereby established and declared to be as set forth in the opinion of the Court, as follows:

1st. Where there are no islands in the boundary rivers, the location of the line between the two States is on the water midway between the main banks of the river when water is at ordinary stage;

2nd. Where there are islands, the line is midway between the island bank and the South Carolina shore when the water is at ordinary stage;

3rd. That all islands formed by nature in the Chattooga river are reserved to Georgia as completely as are those in the Savannah and Tugaloo Rivers.

4th. That the parties to this suit may at any time, by mutual consent, locate and monument the boundary line in any part of the boundary rivers in accordance with the provisions of this decree.

It is further ordered, adjudged, and decreed that the costs of this suit shall be equally divided between the said two States, and that the Clerk of this Court shall forthwith transmit to the Chief Magistrates of the States of Georgia and South Carolina copies of this decree, duly authenticated under the Seal of the Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Complainant,
17, Original. vs.
The State of West Virginia.

The State of Ohio, Complainant,
18, Original. vs.
The State of West Virginia.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the motion for an order fixing the compensation of the Commissioner herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the decision of the case.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway et al., Appellants,
988 vs.
The State of Tennessee et al.

On consideration of the motion for a stay in this case,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William R. Warner & Company, Petitioner,
857 vs.

Eli Lilly & Company.

On consideration of the motion for a supersedeas in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,
998 vs.
George Remus et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 13th next, to be heard with No. 591.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fox Film Corporation, Petitioner,
825 & 826. vs.
Frederick M. Knowles et al.

It is ordered by this Court that these cases be placed upon the summary docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Buell V. Stevens, Plaintiff in Error,
401 vs.
Southern Pacific Land Company.

In Error to the District Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Two, of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Two, of the State of California, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ralph E. Stevens, Administrator, etc., Plaintiff in Error,
402 vs.
Southern Pacific Land Company.

In Error to the District Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Two, of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Two, of

the State of California, and on motion to dismiss or affirm, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mary V. Beggs, Plaintiff in Error, 403 vs. Southern Pacific Land Company. In Error to the District Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Two, of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Two, of the State of California, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, 20, Original. vs. The State of Texas. It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the exceptions and objections of the United States to certain recommendations made in the Seventh Report of the Receiver, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the decision of the case.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

August V. Anderson, etc., Petitioner, 972 vs. Arthur Corall. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wallace Benedict, as Receiver, etc., Petitioner, 994 vs. Aaron Ratner. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arkansas Anthracite Coal & Land Company, Petitioner,
894 vs.
Mary A. Stokes.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arkansas Anthracite Coal & Land Company, Petitioner,
895 vs.
Fremont Stokes.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. L. Lancaster et al., Receivers of the Texas & Pacific Railway, Petitioners,
897 vs.
Mrs. Clara Allen, Administratrix, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Sixth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Sixth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Emma C. Bergdoll et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

933

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles A. Brawn et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

934

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles A. Brawn et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

935

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Emma C. Bergdoll et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

936

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James E. Romig, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

937

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry W. Perry et al., Trustees, etc., Petitioners, vs. The Para Rubber Company of Pennsylvania. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

940

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Public Service Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Harold Wursthorn, an Infant, etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

941

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Barney Little, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

950

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this

Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Douglas Newton, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 955

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robins Drydock & Repair Company, Petitioner, vs. Pan American Petroleum & Transport Company. 958

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

David H. Riddle, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 964

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Baltimore Talking Board Company, Petitioner, vs. Joshua W. Miles, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc. 966

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court

that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Patterson-Sargent Company, Petitioner, vs. H. H. Rumble et al., Trustees, etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

967

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The People of Porto Rico, Petitioner, vs. Fortuna Estates et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

969

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hon. Harland B. Howe, District Judge, etc., Petitioner, vs. The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

970

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gillette Safety Razor Company, Petitioner, vs. James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

979

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Al Vesely, Petitioner, 982 vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Tom Tierney, Petitioner, 983 vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harvey Laundry Company & Refining Company, Petitioner, 984 vs. The Permutit Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Danish Pride Milk Products Company, Petitioner, 985 vs. Paul Stuppel, Inc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the

United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ford Motor Company, Petitioner, 986 vs. Hotel Woodward Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Petitioner, 987 vs. John P. Pugh. — On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The New Orleans Land Company, Petitioner, 989 vs. Robert B. Brott et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Rocky Mountain Fuel Company, Petitioner, 990 vs. The Consolidated Coal & — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charleston & Western Carolina Railway Company, Petitioner,
996 vs.
John Williams.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Max Pottash et al., etc., Petitioners,
323 vs.
Herman Reach & Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

It is ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of prosecution.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William S. Leib, Petitioner,
338 vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Superior Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

It is ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court of the State of Pennsylvania be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of prosecution.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George Yaffee, Petitioner,
734 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

It is ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of prosecution.

John Barton Payne, Federal Agent, Petitioner, vs. Matilda Garvin. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

828

It is ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of prosecution.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Barton Payne, Federal Agent, Petitioner, vs. Nish Torrence et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

829

It is ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of prosecution.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Bessie R. Innis, Petitioner, vs. I. Noble Heft et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

837

It is ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of prosecution.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Connecticut, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Thomas McAuliffe. — In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Connecticut.

711

It appearing to the Court that a suggestion of the death of the defendant in error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said suggestion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that this cause be, and the same is hereby, abated.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Northern Pacific Railway

Plaintiffs in Error,
605 vs.
Ham, Yearsley & Ryrie.

In Error to the Supreme Court of Washington.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sloan Shipyards Corporation et al.,
Appellants,
308 vs.
United States Shipping Board
Emergency Fleet Corporation et al.;

Astoria Marine Iron Works,
Plaintiff in Error,
376 vs.
United States Shipping Board
Emergency Fleet Corporation; and

United States Shipping Board
Emergency Fleet Corporation,
etc., Petitioner,
526 vs.
Roger B. Wood, Trustee, etc.

On motion of Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Goff in that behalf, the mandates herein were stayed, and leave granted to present petition for rehearing within sixty days.

John S. Kendall, Administrator,
etc., et al., Appellants,
157 vs.
Paul A. Ewert;

Paul A. Ewert, Appellant,
173 vs.
Carrie Bluejacket, a widow,
et al.; and

Carrie Bluejacket, a widow,
et al., Appellants,

186 vs.
Paul A. Ewert.

On motion of Mr. Will R.King in that behalf, the mandates herein were stayed, and leave granted to present petition for rehearing within sixty days.

Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York,
Plaintiff in Error,
215 vs.
Mary S. Liebing.

On motion of Mr. Frederic D. McKenney in that behalf, the mandate herein was stayed, and leave granted to present petition for rehearing within sixty days.

United Mine Workers of America et al.,
Petitioners,
29 vs.
Coronado Coal Company et al.; and
United Mine Workers of America et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
31 vs.
Coronado Coal Company et al.

On motion of Mr. Daniel Davenport in that behalf, the mandate herein was stayed, and leave granted to present petition for rehearing within ninety days.

Great Northern Railway Company et al.,
Petitioners,
302 vs.
Merchants Elevator Company.

On motion of Mr. John C. Brooke in that behalf, the mandate herein was stayed, and leave granted to present petition for rehearing within sixty days.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
5 vs.
Southern Pacific Company et al.

On motion of Mr. C. F. R. Ogilby in that behalf, the mandate herein was stayed, and leave granted to present petition for rehearing within sixty days, if so advised.

The Federal Baseball Club of Baltimore, Inc.,
Plaintiff in Error,

204 vs.
The National League of Professional
Baseball Clubs et al.

On motion of Mr. Hugh H. Obear in that behalf, the mandate herein was stayed, and leave granted to present petition for rehearing within thirty days.

The State of Wyoming, Complainant,
3, Original. vs.
The State of Colorado et al.

On motion of Mr. Frederick S.Tyler in that behalf, leave was granted to present petition for rehearing within sixty days.

ORDER.

It is now here ordered by the Court that all the cases on the docket not decided and all the other business of the term not disposed of be, and the same are hereby, continued to the next term.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until the time and place appointed by law.

VOL

19

UME

22

At the Capitol of the United States, in the City of Washington, and District of Columbia, being the present seat of the National Government of the United States, on the first Monday of October (being the 2nd day of the same month) in the year of our Lord one thousand, nine hundred and twenty-two and of the Independence of the United States the one hundred and forty-seventh, the Supreme Court of the United States met agreeably to law.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices.
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hoyle Colquitt, it is ordered that John Thomas Taylor, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tracy L. Jeffords, it is ordered that Robert R. Bennett, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Thomas F. Barrett, Esquire, of Clarksburg, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl E. Whitney, it is ordered that Frederick E. Weeks, Esquire, of White Plains, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry E. Asp, it is ordered that Alvin Richards, Esquire, and Ira Julian Underwood,

and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that J. J. Laton, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, Edward J. Thobaben, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, and Bruce W. Sanborn, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William P. Bynum, it is ordered that W. S. O'B. Robinson, Jr., Esquire, of Charlotte, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hampson Gary, it is ordered that W. B. Harrell, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William M. Williams, it is ordered that James J. Mayfield, Esquire, of Montgomery, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edmund D. Adcock, it is ordered that William F. Mulvihill, Esquire, and Clyde L. Day, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward S. Bailey, it is ordered that E. W. MacPherran, Esquire, of Duluth, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Daniel M. Beach, it is ordered that Harry Otis Poole, Esquire, of Rochester, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. S. Easby-Smith, it is ordered that Donald R. Richberg, Esquire, of Chicago, State of

Illinois, and Thomas Stevenson, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas P. Boyd, it is ordered that H. W. B. Taylor, Esquire, of San Anselmo, and Carey Van Fleet, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sanford H. E Freund, it is ordered that Harry Long, Esquire, of Muncie, State of Indiana and William W. Worthington, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. Riter, it is ordered that Horace Holley Smith, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. P. Gore, it is ordered that Alvin F. Molony, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ewing H. Scott, it is ordered that Charles J. Holland, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. M. Allison, it is ordered that Gibson A. Marr, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. S. Flannery, it is ordered that Amos Thomas, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, and Alfred G. Reeves, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. O'B. Cooper, it is ordered that J. Westmore Willcox, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Lyon, it is ordered that Leonard S. Lyon, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wilton J. Lambert, it is ordered that Charles P. R. Macaulay, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry P. Blair, it is ordered that Allan S. Locke, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles J. Kappler, it is ordered that Warner E. Whipple, Esquire, of Duluth, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage, it is ordered that Sidney Thorne Able, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice said:

"Since the court adjourned, Mr. Justice Clarke has resigned as a member of this Court and the President has accepted his resignation. The President has nominated and the Senate has confirmed Mr. George Sutherland to the vacancy thus created. The Clerk will read the commission."

The Clerk then read the commission, and immediately thereafter the oath of office was administered by Mr. Chief Justice Taft, and Mr. Justice Sutherland was conducted to his seat on the bench by the Marshal.

Which said commission and oath are in the following words and figures, viz:

"WARREN G. HARDING,

PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

To all who shall see these Presents, Greeting:

KNOW YE: That reposing special trust and confidence in the Wisdom, Uprightness, and Learning of GEORGE SUTHERLAND, of Utah, I have nominated and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, do appoint him to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, and do authorize and empower him to execute and fulfil the duties of that office according to the Constitution and Laws of the said United States and to Have and to Hold the said Office, with all the powers, privileges and emoluments to the same of right appertaining unto Him, the said GEORGE SUTHERLAND, during his good behavior, commencing September 18, 1922.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have caused these Letters to be made patent and the seal of the Department of Justice to be hereunto affixed.

S E A L

Done at the City of Washington this fifth day of September, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred twenty two, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-seventh.

WARREN G. HARDING.

By the President:

H. M. DAUGHERTY,

Attorney General."

"SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

I, GEORGE SUTHERLAND, do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same, that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

GEORGE SUTHERLAND.

Subscribed and sworn to before
me this 2 day of October, A.D.1922.

WM. H. TAFT,
Chief Justice of the United States. "

"SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

I, GEORGE SUTHERLAND, do solemnly swear that I will administer justice without respect to persons, and do equal right to the poor and to the rich, and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all the duties incumbent on me as Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States according to the best of my abilities and understanding, agreeably to the Constitution and laws of the United States. So help me God.

GEORGE SUTHERLAND.

Subscribed and sworn to before
me this 2 day of October, A.D.1922.

WM. H. TAFT,
Chief Justice
of the United States."

The Chief Justice announced that after entertaining motions for admission to the bar, the court would adjourn in order that the members of the court might pay their respects to the President of the United States; and that all motions noticed for today will be taken tomorrow, and the court will then commence the call of the docket pursuant to the twenty-sixth rule.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, October 3rd, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices.

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

George Sutherland.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, it is ordered that Edward D. Lyman, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Royal E. T Rigrs, it is ordered that William H. Seibert, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E. Alter, it is ordered that William L. Pace, Esquire, and Harold J. Mahon, Esquire, of Pittston, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Meyer Kraushaar, it is ordered that Emanuel Celler, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. P. Axtell, it is ordered that Kenneth I. McKay, Esquire, of Tampa, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi Cooke,

it is ordered that Clarence Lippel, Esquire, Carl C. Mullin, Esquire, and Arch A. Young, Esquire, of Cumberland, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander Britton, it is ordered that Lawrence H. Cake, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Riley H. Heath, Esquire, of Ithaca, State of New York, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert R. Palmer, it is ordered that Charles H. Lawson, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. Garland Dupre', it is ordered that Arthur A. Moreno, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edmund D. Adcock, it is ordered that George V. McIntyre, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. C. Allen, it is ordered that Robert M. Rainey, Esquire, and Streeter B. Flynn, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
457 vs.
Frederick L. Merriam.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner, and by Mr. Roy C. Gasser for the respondent.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
458 vs.
Henry B. Anderson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner, and by

Mobile Shipbuilding Company,
Petitioner,
465 vs.
Federal Bridge & Structural Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner, and by Mr. Amos C. Miller and Mr. William E. Black for the respondent.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
535 vs.
Raymond Bros.-Clark Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner.

The United States,
Petitioner,
578 vs.
Lippmann, Spier & Hahn.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. William C. Herron for the petitioner and by Mr. George J. Puckhafer for the respondent.

Seaboard Air Line Railway et al.,
Company, Plaintiffs in Error,
407 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the defendant in error.

Capitol Life Insurance Company, Plaintiff in Error,
43 vs.
Mary C. Ross.

The motion for leave to file affidavit of counsel and certificates of Clerk of the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri as to petitions to said Court for writs of mandamus and certiorari to review the judgment of the Kansas City Court of Appeals herein was submitted by Mr. James M. Beck in behalf of counsel.

R. C. Wood et al.,
Petitioners,
540 vs.
F. G. Noyes, as Receiver, etc.

The petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. H. Metson, Mr. Robert W. Jennings, and Mr. Louis P. Shackleford for the petitioners and by Mr. John E. Alexander for the respondent.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Complainant,
--- Orig'l. vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary

The motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein was submitted by Mr. Edwin H. Abbott, Jr., for the complainant.

Federal Land Bank of New Orleans,
Plaintiff in Error,
428 vs.
D. W. Crossland, Judge of Probate.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William M. Williams in behalf of Mr.W.A.Gunter and Mr.Wm.A.Dufour for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition, and by Mr. J. J. Mayfield and Mr. Harwell G. Davis in opposition thereto.

Mildred McIntosh, Plaintiff in Error,
386 vs.
W. H. Dill and M. E. Dill.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas H. Owen and Mr. George C. Crump for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition and by Mr. Nathan A. Gibson and Mr. Joseph L. Hull for the defendants in error in opposition thereto.

United Shoe Machinery Corporation et al.,
119, Oct. Term, 1921.
Appellants,
vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to interpret the Court's opinion herein was submitted by Mr. J. A. Kratz in behalf of counsel.

Whiting Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
527 vs.
Alvin Silver Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William W. Bride in behalf of Mr. Livingston Gifford, Mr. Robert C. Beatty, and Mr. Hugo Mock for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles Neave for the respondent.

Whiting Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
527 vs.
Alvin Silver Company, Inc.

On motion of Mr. Robert Ramsey in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief herein of Mr. Harry D. Nims and Mr. Robert Ramsey, in behalf of Cheney Brothers and others, as amici curiae.

Whiting Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
527 vs.
Alvin Silver Company, Inc.

On motion of Mr. Otto Schlobohm in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief herein of Mr. William J. Hughes and Mr. Otto Schlobohm in behalf of Keystone Watchcase Co. et al., as amici curiae.

The United States of America ex rel, Pet. of George F. Bendict, Dunter, etc.
Seth Gettys et al., etc.,
Plaintifrs in Error,
183 vs.
Silvan Newburger et al.

motion to advance submitted by Mr. Royal E. T. Rigge of counsel for defendant in error.
The motion to dismiss or affirm herein was submitted by Mr. Bernard Titche, Mr. Henry E. Asp, and Mr. Henry G. Snyder for the defendants in error in

R. R. Bell for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Ranger Refining & Pipe Line Company et al., Petitioners, 466 vs. J. E. Dryden et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Bernard Titche and Mr. Francis C. Downey for the petitioners, and by Mr. F. M. Etheridge and Mr. Joseph Manson McCormick for the respondents.

Ex parte In the matter of Huey P. Long et al., Petitioners. ---, Original.

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted by Mr. W. M. Barrow and Mr. Huey L. Long for the petitioners.

Department of Trade and Commerce of the State of Nebraska et al., etc., Petitioners, 467 vs. A. J. Hertz et al., etc., Receivers, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Amos Thomas in behalf of Mr. Halleck F. Rose and Mr. Arthur H. Wells for the petitioners, and by Mr. Bruce W. Sanborn for the respondents.

Lion Bonding & Surety Company, Petitioner, 574 vs. A. H. Karatz.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Amos Thomas in behalf of Mr. Halleck F. Rose and Mr. Arthur H. Wells for the petitioner, and by Mr. Bruce W. Sanborn for the respondent.

Department of Trade and Commerce of the State of Nebraska et al., Appellants, 557 vs. A. J. Hertz et al., Receivers, etc., et al.

The motion to dismiss this appeal was submitted by Mr. Bruce W. Sanborn for the appellees in support of the motion, and by Mr. John F. Stout, Mr. Halleck F. Rose, and Mr. Arthur H. Wells in opposition thereto.

Pennsylvania Coal Company, Plaintiff in Error, 549 vs. H. J. Mahon et al.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. G. Dickson in that behalf.

Automatic Pencil Sharpener Company, Petitioner,
499 vs.
Boston Pencil Pointer Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Morven Thompson in behalf of Mr. George L. Wilkinson and Mr. Edward O. Proctor for the petitioner, and by Mr. Asa P. French for the respondent. The motion as to printing record as exhibit to petition herein was submitted by Mr. Morven Thompson in behalf of counsel for petitioner.

American Railway Express Company, Petitioner,
424 vs.
Lucius P. Levee.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Arthur A. Moreno, Mr. Hunter C. Leake, and Mr. A. M. Hartung for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles T. Wortham for the respondent.

James C. Davis, Agent, etc., Petitioner,
448 vs.
Harold Preston.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Arthur A. Moreno and Mr. A. A. McLaughlin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Oscar S. Hill for the respondent.

Guiseppe Moretti, Petitioner,
455 vs.
John Wiley et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Malcolm S. McN. Watts for the petitioner, with leave to counsel for the respondents to file brief within two weeks, on motion of Mr. Neyle Colquitt in that behalf.

Harry Goldberg et al., Petitioners,
501 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Neyle Colquitt for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. George E. Bowen for the respondent.

United States Grain Corporation,
290 vs.
Wallace B. Phillips.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Neyle Colquitt in that behalf.

The Bacon Brothers Company, Petitioner, 586 vs. E. Frank Grable, Individually, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas H. Tracy and Mr. George D. Welles for the petitioner, and by Mr. George E. Brand, Mr. Harold W. Fraser, and Mr. U. S. Bratton for the respondent.
Ex parte In the matter of The Bacon Brothers Company, Petitioner. ---, Original.	The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus and a writ of prohibition herein was submitted by Mr. George D. Welles for the petitioner.
Toledo Scale Company, Petitioner, 539 vs. The Computing Scale Company.	The motion for leave to take testimony, etc., was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George D. Welles for the petitioner.
The State of Wyoming, Complainant, 3, Orig'l. Oct. Term, 1921. vs. The State of Colorado.	On motion of Mr. William L. Walls in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief in opposition to petition for rehearing.
The State of Wyoming, Complainant, 3, Orig'l. Oct. Term, 1921. vs. The State of Colorado.	On motion of Mr. Samuel Russell in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief in support of petition for rehearing.
B. F. Trappey & Sons, Petitioner, 553 vs. McIlhenny Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William L. Symons for the petitioner, and by Mr. Joseph S. Clark and Mr. Edward S. Rogers for the respondent.
Oliver Iron Mining Company, Appellant, 560 vs. Samuel Lord et al.; Cleveland-Cliffs Iron Company, Appellant, 561 vs.	

Mesaba-Cliffs Iron Company,
Appellant,
562 vs.
Samuel Lord et al.;
Bennett Mining Company et al.,
Appellants,
563 vs.
Samuel Lord et al.;
Republic Iron & Steel Company et al.,
Appellants,
564 vs.
Samuel Lord et al.;
The Biwabik Mining Company et al.,
Appellants,
565 vs.
Samuel Lord et al.; and
Inter-State Iron Company,
Appellant,
566 vs.
Samuel Lord et al.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted by Mr. Egbert S. Oakley in that behalf.

Union Electric Welding Company,
Petitioner,
481 vs.
John P. Curry et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas H. Tracy, Mr. George D. Welles, and Mr. Charles E. Brock for the petitioner, and by Mr. Samuel Owen Edmonds and Mr. Wilbur Owen for the respondents.

Charles Keller et al., constituting the Board of Public Utility Commissioners of the District of Columbia, Appellants,
260 vs.
Potomac Electric Power Company.

The motion to advance this case was submitted by Mr. Conrad H. Syme for the appellants.

Mary Partridge, Plaintiff in Error,
410 vs.
J. E. Crosbie et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Burt E. Barlow for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition, and by Mr. [illegible]

Davidson and Mr. Preston C. West for the respondents. Leave was granted counsel for the petitioner to file the record herein when printed.

The Altitude Oil Company, Plaintiff in Error,
512 vs.
The People of the State of Colorado.

The motion to dismiss or affirm herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Victor E. Keyes for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Norton Montgomery for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Seth Gettys et al., etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
183 vs.
Silvan Newburger et al.

On motion of Mr. R. R. Bell for the plaintiffs in error, leave was granted to file a supplemental brief in answer to the motion to dismiss.

James C. Davis, as Agent, etc., Petitioner,
573 vs.
The Portland Seed Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur C. Spencer, Mr. Charles E. Cochran, and Mr. John F. Finerty for the petitioner.

The Peoples Development Company, Appellant,
304 vs.
Southern Pacific Company et al., etc.

The motion to affirm herein was submitted by Mr. Frank Thuman and Mr. C. F. H. Ogilby for the appellees in support of the motion, and by Mr. T. C. West for the appellant in opposition thereto.

Union Stock Yards Company of Omaha, Plaintiff in Error,
409 vs.
Mayhall & Neible, a copartnership, et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. F. Colladay in behalf of Mr. Norris Brown and Mr. Irving F. Baxter for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition, and by Mr. Francis A. Brogan, Mr. Alfred G. Ellick, and Mr. Anon Raymond for the defendants in error in opposition thereto.

Charles G. Binderup, Petitioner,
449 vs.
Pathe Exchange, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Irving F. Baxter and Mr. Norris Brown for the petitioner, and by Mr. William M. Seabury and Mr. Saul E. Rogers for the

Charles L. Craig, Petitioner,
488 vs.
William C. Hecht, U. S. Marshal, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John P. O'Brien and Mr. Edmund L. Mooney for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. William Haywood for the respondent.

The State of Wisconsin, Complainant,
23, Orig'l. vs.
The State of Illinois et al.

On motion of Mr. William V. Mulvihill in that behalf, leave was granted to file joint and several answer.

Henry E. DeKay, Petitioner,
551 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins in behalf of Mr. William L. Wemple for the petitioner; with leave to counsel for the petitioner to file the record when printed.

Oklahoma Gas & Electric Company et al., Appellants,
419 vs.
Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma et al.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. B. Flynn for the appellants.

Oklahoma Natural Gas Company, Appellant,
406 vs.
Campbell Russell et al., constituting the Corporation Commission of Oklahoma et al.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. B. Flynn for the appellant.

Arkansas Natural Gas Company, Appellant,
500 vs.
Arkansas Railroad Commission et al.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. B. Flynn for the appellant.

Oklahoma Natural Gas Company, Appellant,
406 vs.
Campbell Russell et al., constituting the Corporation Commission of Oklahoma, et al.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. J. Underwood for the appellees.

Frank Terrace et al.,
Appellants,
302 vs.
Lindsay L. Thompson,
Attorney General of the
State of Washington.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the considerarion of the Court by Mr. Lindsay L. Thompson for the appellee.

Mildred McIntosh,
Plaintiff in Error,
386 vs.
W. H. Dill et al.

The motion to dismiss and brief in opposition to petition for a writ of certiorari herein were submitted by Mr. Alexander Britton for the defendants in error in support of the motion.

Exchange Oil Company,
Appellant,
12,13,14 & 15. vs.
F. C. Carter, as State
Auditor, etc., et al.

On motion of Mr. Levi Cooke in behalf of counsel, it was ordered that these cases be passed, pursuant to the 26th rule.

Roland C. Heisler,
Plaintiff in Error,
541 vs.
Thomas Colliery Company
et al.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George E. Alter in that behalf.

The New York Central Railroad Company, Petitioner,
433 vs.
Middleport Gas & Electric
Light Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry H. Gower in behalf of Mr. Maurice C. Spratt for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward H. Letchworth for the respondent.

Southern Power Company,
Petitioner,
554 vs.
North Carolina Public
Service Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William P. Bynum, Mr. R. V. Lindabury, and Mr. R. C. Strudwick for the petitioner, and by Mr. John W. Davis and Mr. Aubrey L. Brooks for the respondents.

William A. Prendergast et al.,
etc., Appellants,

542 vs.

New York Telephone Company.

The motion to advance this case was submitted by Mr. Wilber W. Chambers, Mr. Ledyard P. Hale, and Mr. Simon Fleischmann for the appellants.

Oklahoma Gas & Electric Company et al., Appellants,
419 vs.
Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma et al.

The motion to advance this case was submitted by Mr. Henry E. Asp in behalf of counsel.

Trustees of the United States-Mexico Oil Company, Plaintiffs in Error,
323 vs.
T. W. Harris.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William W. Fry for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition.

Mrs. Eugenia Brooks, Administratrix, etc., Petitioner,
337 vs.
Seaboard Air Line Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Westmoreland for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hollins N. Randolph and Mr. Robert S. Parker for the respondent.

Ludwig Wolfgram, Petitioner,
397 vs.
Ritchie T. Marsh, Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lowrie C. Barton for the petitioner.

Albert Rowan et al., Petitioners,
398 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jed C. Adams for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, Petitioner,
399 vs.
William R. Coyle, Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John F. Finerty for the petitioner, and by Mr. Emory R. Buckner for the respondent.

William S. Livezey, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 401

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jed C. Adams for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Morris Reinstein et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 405

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Elijah N. Zoline for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. William C. Herron for the respondent.

American Can Company, Petitioner, vs. Frank Funkhouser. 411

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horace Kent Tenney, Mr. Andrew D. Collins, Mr. Allen L. Chickering, and Mr. Warren Gregory for the petitioner.

American Can Company, Petitioner, vs. M. T. McGoldrick. 412

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horace Kent Tenney, Mr. Andrew D. Collins, Mr. Allen L. Chickering, and Mr. Warren Gregory for the petitioner.

American Can Company, Petitioner, vs. Samuel J. Wilson. 413

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horace Kent Tenney, Mr. Andrew D. Collins, Mr. Allen L. Chickering, and Mr. Warren Gregory for the petitioner.

American Can Company, Petitioner, vs. R. B. Rice and W. C. Wharf. 414

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horace Kent Tenney, Mr. Andrew D. Collins, Mr. Allen L. Chickering, and Mr. Warren Gregory for the petitioner.

American Can Company, Petitioner, vs. P. J. Garnett. 415

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horace Kent Tenney, Mr. Andrew D. Collins, Mr. Allen L. Chickering, and Mr.

Warren Gregory for the petitioner, and by Mr. William C. Graves for the respondent.

American Can Company, Petitioner,
416 vs.
Ralph Robinson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horace Kent Tenney, Mr. Andrew D. Collins, Mr. Allen L. Chickering, and Mr. Warren Gregory for the petitioner.

American Can Company, Petitioner,
417 vs.
J. W. Burgan.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horace Kent Tenney, Mr. Andrew D. Collins, Mr. Allen L. Chickering, and Mr. Warren Gregory for the petitioner.

R. D. James, Petitioner,
420 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. S. Baskett for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim and Mr. Harry S.Ridgely for the respondent.

W. Trinidad, as Insular Collector, etc., Petitioner,
423 vs.
Sagrada Orden de Predicatores de la Provincia del Santissimo Rosario de Filipinas.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Grant T. Trent, Mr. Logan N. Rock, and Mr. Carl A. Mapes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Gabriel La O for the respondent.

American Railway Express Company, Petitioner,
424 vs.
Lucius P. Levee.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Hunter C. Leake and Mr. A. M. Hartung for the petitioner.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, etc., Petitioner,
425 vs.
Ellis R. Hyde.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage, Mr. Sidney F. Tallaferro, Mr. C. O. Blake, and Mr. W. R. Bleakmore for the petitioner, and by Mr. W.A.Ledbetter, Mr. H. L. Stuart and Mr. R.R. Bell in opposition thereto.

Western Machinery Company et al., Petitioners,
427 vs.
Richfield Oil Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nathan Newby

Pace for the respondent.

The Pusey & Jones Company, Petitioner, vs. Hans Karluf Hanssen. 431

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lindley M. Garrison for the petitioner, and by Mr. William H. Button, Mr. John P. Nields, and Mr. William G. Mahaffy for the respondent.

King Lumber Company, Petitioner, vs. P. H. Faulconer. 434

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George E. Walker for the petitioner, and by Mr. R. T. W. Duke, Jr., Mr. G. W. McNutt, and Mr. H. W. Walsh for the respondent.

Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Samuel D. Eisenhart. 437

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Clarke Mason for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank P. Davis for the respondent.

Albert Hirshheimer, Petitioner, vs. Ralph B. Hartsough et al. 438

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Aldrich and Mr. Frank M. Hoyt for the petitioner, and by Mr. Amasa C. Paul, Mr. Harry L. Butler and Mr. Frank J. Morley for the respondents.

Benjamin F. Haney, Petitioner, vs. Ralph B. Hartsough. 439

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Aldrich and Mr. Frank M. Hoyt for the petitioner, and by Mr. Amasa C. Paul, Mr. Harry L. Butler and Mr. Frank J. Morley for the respondents.

H. P. Converse et al., Petitioners, vs. Portsmouth Cotton Oil Refining Corporation. 441

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Edward R. Baird, Jr., Mr. Clarence W. DeKnight and Mr. Rufus S. Day Mr. George M. Lanning for the petitioners, and by Mr. Thomas H. Willcox for the respondent.

C. B. Giles et al., Petitioners, vs. Henry Vette et al. 443

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. William Burry and Mr. Lewis F. Jacobson for the petitioners, and by Mr. Horace Kent Tenney, Mr. Harry A. Parkin, Mr. Carl Meyer, and Mr. Henry R. Platt for the respondents.

The Champion Fibre Company, Petitioner,
445 vs.
The Pigeon River Railway Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Julius C. Martin, Mr. Thomas S. Rollins, and Mr. George H. Wright for the petitioner, and by Mr. William P. Bynum for the respondent.

J. L. Albright, Petitioner,
446 vs.
James C. Davis, Director General, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. P. Jones for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ras Young for the respondent.

James C. Davis, Agent, etc., Petitioner,
448 vs.
Harold Preston.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. A. McLaughlin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Oscar S. Hill for the respondent.

Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York, Petitioner,
454 vs.
Hurni Packing Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick L. Allen for the petitioner.

The Shenango Furnace Company et al., Petitioners,
460 vs.
The Village of Buhl et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William D. Bailey and Mr. Alfred Jaques for the petitioner, and by Mr. William E. Culkin for the respondents.

Central Power & Light Company, Petitioner,
461 vs.
Town of Pocahontas et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Joe T. Robinson, Mr. Joseph W. House, Jr., Mr. Charles T. Coleman, and Mr. H. L. Ponder for the petitioner.

James C. Davis, Director General, etc., Petitioner,

462 vs.
George Wechsler.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. M. Langworthy, Mr. O. H. Dean, and Mr. Roy B. Thomson for the petitioner, and by Mr. William S. Hogsett and Mr. Mont T. Prewitt for the respondent.

Ranger Refining & Pipe Line Company et al., Petitioners,
466 vs.
J. E. Dryden et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bernard Titche and Mr. Francis C. Downey for the petitioners, and by Mr. Francis M. Etheridge and Mr. Joseph Manson McCormick for the respondents.

Department of Trade & Commerce of the State of Nebraska et al., etc., Petitioners,
467 vs.
A. J. Hertz et al., etc., Receivers, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Halleck F. Rose and Mr. Arthur R. Wells for the petitioners, and by Mr. Bruce W. Sanborn for the respondents.

James C. Davis, as Agent, etc., Petitioner,
468 vs.
Lee A. Wolfe.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage, Mr. James C. Jones, Mr. Lon O. Hocker, and Mr. Frank H. Sullivan for the petitioner, and by Mr. P. H. Cullen for the respondent.

Jess Shipley & Humpy Bob Vaughn, Petitioners,
470 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Waters Davis for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. George E. Boren for the respondent.

Canute Steamship Company, Ltd., et al., Petitioners,
471 vs.
Pittsburgh & West Virginia

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles E. Hicker and Mr. Delbert M. Tibbetts for the petitioners, and by Mr. John W. Davis, and Mr. Theodore Kiendl/ Mr. Tracy L. Jeffords for

the respondents.

The Salem Trust Company,
Petitioner,
474 vs.
Manufacturers' Finance Company
et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander Whiteside for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert C. Dodge for the respondents.

Victor Talking Machine Company,
Petitioner,
475 vs.
The Starr Piano Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Houston Kenyon and Mr. John D. Myers for the petitioner, and by Mr. Parker W. Page and Mr. Drury W. Cooper for the respondent.

Theodore A. Heyer, etc.,
Petitioner,
476 vs.
Duplicator Manufacturing Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel Walker Banning and Mr. Thomas A. Banning for the petitioner, and by Mr. George L. Wilkinson for the respondent.

Alabama & Vicksburg Railway
Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
479 vs.
Louis F. Dennis.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Blanc Monroe, Mr. Monte M. Lemann, Mr. R. H. Thompson, Mr. S..L. McLaurin, and Mr. Walter J. Suthon, Jr., for the plaintiffs in error in support of the petition, and by Mr.William H. Watkins in opposition thereto.

Pocsanaann Alexander & Alpha
Laboratories (Inc.),
Petitioner,
486 vs.
General Electric Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Patrick P. Curran for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederick P. Fish and Mr. Hubert Howson for the respondent.

Producers Warehouse Association,
Petitioner,
489 vs.
Philippine National Bank.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry Breckenridge, Mr. Clement L. Bouve, and Mr. A. Warner Parker for the petitioner.

J. H. Riley, Petitioner,
490 vs.

O. C. McRaney.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. W.H. Watkins for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert H. Thompson for the respondent.

Bear, Sondheimer & Company, Inc., Petitioner,
493 vs.
American & Cuban Steamship Line, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. D. Roger Englar for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank V. Barnes for the respondent.

The Matthew Addy Company, Petitioner,
494 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nelson B. Cramer for the petitioner.

Benjamin N. Ford, Petitioner,
495 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nelson B. Cramer for the petitioner.

George M. Embiricos, Petitioner,
496 vs.
Stuyvesant Insurance Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert S. Erskine and Mr. D. M. Tibbetts for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ezra P. Prentice for the respondent.

The Andrew Jergens Company, Petitioner,
502 vs.
William A. Woodbury Distributors, Inc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter A. de Camp, Mr. Keyes Winter and Mr. Edward D. Rogers for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas B. Felder for the respondents.

Mrs. Essie Lee Jones, Administratrix of Robert C. Jones, etc., Petitioner,
503 vs.
Central of Georgia Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Emmett Houser and Mr. Thomas Swift Felder for the petitioner, and by Mr. T. M. Cunningham, Jr., and Mr. Richard C. Jordan for the respondent.

James C. Davis, Federal Agent of Railways, et al., etc., Petitioners, vs. Mrs. Walter Morgan, Administratrix, etc.

504

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank C.Dillard and Mr. George Thompson for the petitioners, and by Mr. S. P. Jones in opposition thereto.

Iponmatsu Ukichi et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America.

505

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. A.Douthitt and Mr. Charles S. Davis for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. William C. Herron for the respondent.

William T. Price et al., Petitioners, vs. Magnolia Petroleum Company et al.

506

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. E. Blake, Mr. A. T. Boys, Mr. C. B. Stuart, Mr. J. F. Sharpe and Mr. M. K. Cruce for the petitioners, and by Mr. George F. Short, Mr.C.W. King, Mr. W.H.Francis and Mr. B.B.Blakeney for the respondents.

Morgenstern & Company, Inc., Petitioner, vs. The Hoffman-La Roche Chemical Works, Inc.

507

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. A. L.Massie for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hans v. Briesen for the respondent.

Ernest W. Kokemor, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

508

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. S. Hebert for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr.Assistant Attorney General Crim and Mr. Harry S.Ridgely for the respondent.

Samuel A. Myers et al., Petitioners, vs. International Trust Company.

512

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward F. McClennen for the petitioners, and by Mr. John H. Lazenby for the respondent.

Board of Trade of the City of Chicago, Petitioner, vs. E. H. Johnson, Trustee, etc.

513

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry S. Robbins for the petitioners.

The Parish Company, Petitioner,
514 vs.
South Side Trust Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henson M. Stephens for the petitioner, and by Mr. William M. Robinson and Mr. H. V. Blaxter for the respondent.

Ella Howey, Petitioner,
516 vs.
William J. Howey.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. C. W. Prince for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry S. Conrad for the respondent.

Sylvester Carollo, Petitioner,
517 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. Howard McCaleb for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Clair D. Jones, Petitioner,
519 vs.
Inter-Mountain Life Insurance Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank K. Nebeker for the petitioner.

Webster Electric Company, Petitioner,
520 vs.
Splitdorf Electrical Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Herbert B. Moses for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward Rector and Mr. Eugene H. Mason for the respondent.

Woolwine Metal Products Company, Petitioner,
521 vs.
Willis J. Boyle, Sr.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick S. Lyon for the petitioner, and by Mr. John H. Miller for the respondent.

Manuel Blakind, Petitioner,
523 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ben B. Wickham for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Samuel Rembrandt, Petitioner,
524 vs.

The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ben B. Wickham for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim and Mr. Franklin C.Wixson for the respondent.

Harry O. Phillips, Petitioner,
531 vs.
Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John H. Kay and Mr. Charles W. Miller for the petitioner, with leave to counsel for the respondent to file brief within one week.

Simon Hecht et al., Petitioners,
532 vs.
John F. Malley, former Collector of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward F. McClennen, Mr. William H. Dunbar and Mr. Allison L. Newton for the petitioners, with leave to counsel for the respondent to file brief within one week.

Arthur L. Howard et al., Petitioners,
533 vs.
John F. Malley, former Collector of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward F. McClennen, Mr. William H. Dunbar, and Mr. Allison L. Newton for the petitioners, with leave to counsel for the respondent to file brief within one week.

Arthur L. Howard et al., Petitioners,
534 vs.
Andrew J. Casey, former Acting Collector of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward F. McClennen, Mr. William H. Dunbar, and Mr. Allison L. Newton for the petitioners.

Frank P. Helm, Petitioner,
538 vs.
American Hawaiian Steamship Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nathan H. Frank and Mr. Irving H. Frank for the petitioner, and by Mr. Stanley Moore for the respondent.

John G. Crosland, Petitioner,
539 vs.
Benjamin E. Dyson, U. S. Marshal, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bart A.Riley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt and Mr. George E. Bower for the respondent.

Standard Oil Company (Indiana), Petitioner, 544 vs. James R. Henry.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel D. Miller, Mr. Frank C. Dailey, Mr. William H. Thompson, and Mr. C. C. LeForgee for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward M. White for the respondent.

Cudahy Packing Company of Nebraska, Plaintiff in Error and Petitioner, 547 vs. Mary Ann Parramore, as widow, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George T. Buckingham for the plaintiff in error and petitioner, and by Mr. William A. Hilton for the defendant in error and respondent.

Standard Oil Company of Louisiana, Petitioner, 548 vs. Roy P. Parham.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hunter C. Leake, Mr. Marcellus Green, Mr. Garner W. Green, and Mr. C. O. Swain for the petitioner, and by Mr. William D. Anderson for the respondent.

Farm Mortgage & Loan Company, Petitioner, 558 vs. John R. Hazel, Judge, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank Gibbons for the petitioner.

Samuel M. Grossman, Petitioner, 559 vs. The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin C. Bachrach and Mr. David D. Stansbury for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Robert P. Reeder, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

W. H. Goff Company, Petitioner, 567 vs. Lamborn & Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick T. Sansay and Mr. Edgar Watkins for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert M. Hitch and Mr. A. B. Lovett for the respondent.

Red Cross Line, Petitioner, 568 vs.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Homer L. Loomis for the petitioner, and

Walter S. Hallanan, State Tax Commissioner, etc., et al., Petitioners,
569 vs.
The Eureka Pipe Line Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. T. England, Mr. S. B. Avis, Mr. William G. Matthews, and Mr. Fred O. Blue for the petitioners.

Walter S. Hallanan, State Tax Commissioner, etc., et al., Petitioners,
570 vs.
United Fuel & Gas Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. T. England, Mr. S. B. Avis, Mr. William G. Matthews, and Mr. Fred O. Blue for the petitioners.

Harry Michelsohn, Petitioner,
571 vs.
Charles F. Dittmar, as Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David H. Bilder for the petitioner, and by Mr. James D. Carpenter, Jr., and Mr. John M. Enright for the respondent.

Lion Bonding & Surety Company, Petitioner,
574 vs.
A. H. Karatz.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hallock F. Rose and Mr. Arthur R. Wells for the petitioner, and by Mr. Bruce W. Sanborn for the respondent.

The Baltimore & Ohio Southwestern Railroad Company, Petitioner,
577 vs.
Guerney O. Burtch.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Morison R. Waite for the petitioner.

The Queen Insurance Company of America, Petitioner,
579 vs.
Globe & Rutgers Fire Insurance Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. Roger Englar and Mr. Oscar R. Houston for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles G. Burlingham and Mr. Van Vechton Veeder for the respondent.

Axel Matson, Petitioner,
580 vs.
Walker D. Hines, Director General, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. Loundes Maury for the petitioner.

Mary Jeannette McNamara et al., Petitioners, 582 vs. John Hamilton McNamara, a minor, etc., et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mary J. McNamara and Margaret J. Thomas, p.p., and by Mr. Robert P. Eckert for the respondent.
James C. Davis, as Agent, etc., Petitioner, 585 vs. E. M. Matthews, Administrator, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry E. Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Felix E. Alley for the respondent.
Ben Rudnor et al., Petitioners, 584 vs. The United States of America.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edmond H. Moore for the petitioners.
Alvah Crocker et al., Trustees, etc., Petitioners, 587 vs. John F. Malley, Collector.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Felix Rackemann for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Ottinger, and Mr. Charles H. Weston for the respondent.
Thomson Spot Welder Company, Petitioner, 589 vs. Ford Motor Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick P. Fish for the petitioner.
Sulzberger & Sons Company, Petitioner, 592 vs. Steamship Hellig Olav et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles R. Hickox for the petitioner, and by Mr. Van Vechten Veeder and Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper for the respondents.
The Texas Company et al., Petitioners, 598 vs. Steamship "Santa Rita",	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John D. Grace for the petitioners, and by Mr. John C. Prizer for the respondent.

The Pyle-National Company, Petitioner,
600 vs.
Oliver Electric Manufacturing Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John J. Healy and Mr. Francis W. Parker, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edwin E. Huffman for the respondent.

Mary Banks, Petitioner,
605 vs.
The State of Alabama.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. H. Swift for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hartwell G. Davis for the respondent.

American Merchant Marine Insurance Company of New York, Petitioner,
609 vs.
Liberty Sand & Gravel Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. Catesby Jones, Mr. D. Roger Englar and Mr. James D. Carpenter for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert S. Erskine for the respondent.

Simmons Hardware Company, Petitioner,
611 vs.
Southern Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. L. Leonard and Mr. Shepard Barclay for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward C. Kramer, Mr. Bruce A. Campbell, Mr. Alex. P. Humphrey, and Mr. Edward P. Humphrey for the respondent.

Edward J. Brundage, Attorney General of Illinois, Appellant,
90 vs.
The United States of America et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward J. Brundage,
Attorney General of
Illinois, Appellant,
91 vs.
The United States of
America et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. C. Eddy, as Treasurer,
etc., et al., Appellants,
211 vs.
The First National Bank
of Fargo.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

World Publishing Company,
Appellant,
254 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry F. Mueller et al.,
etc., Appellants,
376 vs.

The motion to dismiss the appeal herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward E. Foristel for the appellees in

Hughes and Mr. Ephrin Caplan for the appellants in opposition thereto.

New Orleans & Northeastern Railroad Company et al., Petitioners, vs. Thomas E. Beard. 390

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioners to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered by this Court, that the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William S. Fleming, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 525

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered by this Court, that the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Luella Swartwood, as Sole Administratrix, etc., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Lehigh Valley Railroad Company. 2

This cause was passed pursuant to the twenty-sixth rule.

William R. Begg et al., Receivers, etc., Appellants, vs. The City of New York et al. 5

This cause was passed pursuant to the twenty-sixth rule, per stipulation of counsel.

John Connors, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The People of the State of Illinois. 6

The motion to dismiss the writ of error herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward J. Brundage for the defendant in error, and by Mr. Bush B. Johnson for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Edward O'Donnell, Plaintiff in Error,

7 vs.
The People of the State of
Illinois;
Leonard Banks et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
8 vs.
The People of the State of
Illinois;
Frank Bender, Plaintiff in
Error,
9 vs.
The People of the State of
Illinois;
John Boone, Plaintiff in
Error,
10 vs.
The People of the State of
Illinois;
William Taglia, Plaintiff in
Error,
11 vs.
The People of the State of
Illinois;
Abe Schaffner, Plaintiff in
Error,
23 vs.
The People of the State of
Illinois; and
George Moran, Plaintiff in
Error,
57 vs.
The People of the State of
Illinois.

William W. Knights, Plaintiff
in Error,
167 vs.

These cases are to abide the decision of the Court in case No. 6, submitted on a motion to dismiss.

Receiver General of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

This case was argued by Mr. Philip Nichols for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Edwin H. Abbot, Jr., for the defendant in error.

Transportes Maritimos do Estado,
Claimant, etc., Petitioner,
279 vs.
Tietjen & Lang Dry Dock Company;
Transportes Maritimos do Estado,
Claimant, etc., Petitioner,
280 vs.
Maxwell Rose, etc.;
Transportes Maritimos do Estado,
Claimant, etc., Petitioner,
281 vs.
Maxwell Rose, etc.,;
Transportes Maritimos do Estado,
Claimant, etc., Petitioner,
282 vs.
Thomas de Simone; and
Transportes Maritimos do Estado,
(in personam), Petitioner,
283 vs.
Thomas de Simone.

On motion of Mr. John M. Woolsey in that behalf, leave was granted three counsel to argue these cases for the respondents. The cases were argued by Mr. F. Dudley Kohler for the petitioner, and by Mr. John M. Woolsey, Mr. E. C. Rouse and Mr. Meyer Kraushaar for the respondent.

Takao Ozawa
1 vs.
The United States; and
Takuji Yamashita et al., Petitioners,
177 vs.
J. Grant Hinkle, as Secretary of State of the State of Washington.

On motion of Mr. George W. Wickersham in that behalf, three hours were allowed for the argument of these cases. The argument herein was commenced by Mr. George W. Wickersham for Ozawa in No. 1, and for the petitioners in No. 177.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, October 4th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that Albert K. Stebbins, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, it is ordered that Henry M. Hurd, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. S. Flannery, it is ordered that M. B. Saul, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States, Complainant,
19, Orig'l. vs.
The State of Washington.

On motion of Mr. L. L. Thompson, of counsel for the defendant, leave was granted to file the answer of defendant herein.

Galveston Wharf Company et al., Appellants,
19 vs.
City of Galveston et al.

This case was passed, pursuant to the twenty-sixth rule, per stipulation of counsel.

Hillsboro Coal Company et al., Appellants, 21 vs. Edward C. Knotts, United States District Attorney, etc., et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee, this case was passed pursuant to the twenty-sixth rule, per stipulation of counsel.

Herman C. Perry et al., Appellants, 22 vs. Edward C. Knotts, United States District Attorney, etc., et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee, this case was passed pursuant to the twenty-sixth rule, per stipulation of counsel.

Takao Ozawa 1 vs. The United States; and Takuji Yamashita et al., Petitioners, 177 vs. J. Grant Hinkle, as Secretary of State of the State of Washington.

The argument herein was continued by Mr. George W. Wickersham for Ozawa in No. 1, and for petitioners in No. 177, by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the United States in No. 1, and was concluded by Mr. L. L. Thompson for respondent in No. 177.

On motion of Mr. L. L. Thompson in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Attorney General of California as amicus curiae in this cause, with leave to counsel for Ozawa and petitioners to file answer within one week.

Edward F. Jackman, Plaintiff in Error, 3 vs. The Rosenbaum Company.

This case was argued by Mr. H. F. Stambaugh for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. A. Leo Weil for the defendant in error.

Charlotte Harbor & Northern Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, 4 vs. W. G. Welles et al., etc.

This case was argued by Mr. Kenneth I. McKay for the plaintiff in error. No brief was filed for defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, October 5th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, it is ordered that D. L. Thornbury, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Eli Bunch, Plaintiff in Error,
328 vs.
J. B. Cole et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Streeter B. Flynn and Mr. Dennis T. Flynn for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition.

Albert B. Fall, Secretary of the Interior,
Plaintiff in Error,
25 vs.
The United States of America on the relation of W. T. Mosier et al.

On motion of Mr. Lawrence H. Cake for the defendants in error, this case was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,
26 vs.
Chris Elioff Stafoff, alias Chris Elioff.

On motion of Mr. Assistant Attorney General Ottinger for the plaintiff in error, this case was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

Royal Baking Powder Company, Appellant, vs. George W. Emerson, Prosecuting Attorney, etc.	This case was passed for settlement.
People's National Bank, of Kingfisher, Oklahoma, et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Board of Equalization of Kingfisher County, Oklahoma.	This case was passed for submission.
Greenport Basin & Construction Company, Plaintiff in Error and Appellant, vs. The United States.	On motion of Mr. Assistant Attorney General Ottinger for the defendant in error and appellee, this case was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.
Ephraim Lederer, Collector, etc., Petitioner, vs. Alexander J. Stockton, Sole Surviving Trustee, etc.	This case was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Ottinger for the petitioner, and by Mr. Maurice Bower Saul for the respondent.
Kentucky Finance Corporation, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Paramount Auto Exchange Corporation.	This case was argued by Mr. Albert K. Stebbins for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Walter H. Bender for the defendant in error.
Corona Coal Company, Appellant, vs. Southern Railway Company.	This case was submitted by Mr. Forney Johnston for the appellant, and by Mr. S. R. Prince and Mr. L. E. Jeffries for the appellee.
Sonneborn Brothers, etc., Appellant, vs. Walter A. Keeling, Attorney General, etc.	This case was reargued by Mr. J. M. McCormick for the appellant, and by Mr. E. F. Smith for the appellee.

Thursday, October 5th, 1922, continued.

Eugene A. Freund et al.,

Appellants,

29 vs.

The United States; and

The United States, Appellant,

37 vs.

Eugene A. Freund et al.

The argument herein was commenced by Mr. William H. Harr for Freund et al.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12o'clock.

Friday, October 6th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland.
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles P. Spooner, it is ordered that Ansley W. Sawyer, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The City of New York, Appellant,
588 vs.
New York Telephone Company.

The motion to advance this case was submitted by Mr. Harry Hertzoff in that behalf.

National Union Fire Insurance Company, Plaintiff in Error,
32 vs.
Robert Wanberg.

This case was submitted by Mr. Nathan H. Chase and Mr. William H. Barnett for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. W. B. Overson and Mr. William G. Owens for the defendant in error.

Auditore Contracting Company, Inc., et al., Petitioners,
38 vs.
Foreign Trade Banking Corporation.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf, this case was passed for settlement.

The United States, Plaintiff in Error,
39 vs.
Vito Lanza et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the plaintiff in error, this case was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to section 9 of rule 26.

Friday, October 6th, 1922, continued.

Royal Baking Powder Company,
Appellant,
28 vs.
George W. Emerson, Prosecuting Attorney, etc.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Eugene A. Freund et al.,
Appellants,
29 vs.
The United States; and
The United States,
Appellant,
37 vs.
Eugene A. Freund et al.

The argument of these cases was concluded by Mr. A. A. Wheat for The United States.

North Carolina Railroad Company, Petitioner,
33 vs.
Evelyn K. Lee, Administratrix, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. S. R. Prince for the petitioner, and by Mr. R. C. Strudwick for the respondent.

General Investment Company,
Appellant,
34 vs.
Lake Shore & Michigan Southern Railway Company et al.

This case was argued by Mr. F. A. Henry for the appellant, and by Mr. Walter C. Noyes for the appellee.

New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
35 vs.
David Fruchter, an infant, etc.; and

New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Company, Petitioner,
36 vs.
Sam Fruchter.

The argument in these cases was commenced by Mr. James W. Carpenter for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, October 9th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices.

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

George Sutherland,

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that James Bancroft Scott, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts; Roger Marchetti, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California; and Thomas Fitzhugh Dawson, Esquire, and Thomas Ennalls Waggaman, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William O. Beall, it is ordered that Roy T. Osborn, Esquire, of Independence, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Aaron V. Dawes, it is ordered that William Newcorn, Esquire, of Plainfield, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. H. Ward, it is ordered that Leonard M. Levy, Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel B. Proudfit, it is ordered that John McPhaul, Esquire, of Bastrop, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court,

and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. W. Collins, it is ordered that William Thomas Hammack, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Forney Johnston, it is ordered that Needham A. Graham, Jr., Esquire, of Birmingham, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Wyoming, Complainant, vs. The State of Colorado et al. — No. 3, Orig'l. 1921. — The petition for rehearing is denied, with certain minor modifications in the decree.

Which said modified decree is in the following words and figures, viz:

1. On consideration of the defendants' petition for a rehearing heretofore presented by leave of the court, it is considered, ordered and decreed that the decree entered herein on June 5, 1922, be modified to read as follows:

This cause having been heretofore submitted on the pleadings and the evidence taken before and reported by the commissioners appointed for the purpose, and the Court being now fully advised in the premises:

It is considered, ordered and decreed that the defendants, their officers, agents and servants, be, and they are hereby, severally enjoined from diverting or taking from the Laramie River and its tributaries in the State of Colorado more than fifteen thousand five hundred (15,500) acre-feet of water per annum in virtue of or through what is designated in the pleadings and evidence as the Laramie-Poudre Tunnel appropriation in that State,

Provided, that this decree shall not prejudice the right of the State of Colorado, or of any one recognized by her as duly entitled thereto, to continue to exercise the right now existing and hereby recognized to divert and take from such stream and its tributaries in that State eighteen thousand (18,000) acre-feet of water per annum in virtue of and through what is designated in the pleadings and evidence as the Skyline Ditch appropriation in that State; nor prejudice the right of that State, or of any one recognized by her as duly entitled thereto, to continue to exercise the right now existing and hereby recognized to divert and take from such stream and its tributaries in that State four thousand two hundred and fifty (4,250) acre-feet of water per annum in virtue of and through the meadow-land appropriations in that State which are named in the pleadings and evidence; nor prejudice the right of the State of Colorado, or of any one recognized by her as duly entitled thereto, to continue to exercise the right now existing and hereby recognized to divert and take from the headwaters of Deadman Creek, a Colorado tributary of the Laramie River, the relatively small amount of water appropriated therefrom prior to the year 1902 by and through what is designated in the evidence as the Wilson Supply Ditch; nor prejudice or affect the right of the State of Colorado or the State of Wyoming, or of any one recognized by either State as duly entitled thereto, to continue to exercise the right to divert and use water from Sand Creek, sometimes spoken of as a tributary of the Laramie River, in virtue of any existing and lawful appropriation of the waters of such creek;

And it is also considered, ordered and decreed that the costs of this suit be apportioned among and paid by the parties thereto as follows: The State of Wyoming one-third, the State of Colorado one-third, and the two corporate defendants jointly one-third.

And it is further considered, ordered and decreed that the clerk of this Court do transmit to the chief magistrates of the States of Colorado and Wyoming copies of this decree duly authenticated under the seal of this Court.

2. In view of the modifications hereby made in the decree of June 5, 1922, the petition for rehearing in this cause is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Bill Moore, Plaintiff in Error,
133 vs.
The State of Georgia.

IT IS ORDERED BY THIS COURT that this cause be reassigned for argument on Monday, November 13th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Mills Company, Petitioner,
118 vs.
American Surety Company of New York.

IT IS ORDERED BY THIS COURT that this cause be reassigned for argument on Monday, November 20th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Railway Company, Appellant,
368 vs.
A. D. Watts and A. D. Watts as Commissioner of Revenue, et al.

IT IS ORDERED BY THIS COURT that this cause be reassigned for argument on Monday, November 20th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Atlantic & Yadkin Railway Company, Appellant,
369 vs.
A. D. Watts and A. D. Watts as Commissioner of Revenue, et al.

IT IS ORDERED BY THIS COURT that this cause be reassigned for argument on Monday, November 20th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Appellant,
381 vs.
A. D. Watts and A. D. Watts as Commissioner of Revenue of the State of North Carolina.

IT IS ORDERED BY THIS COURT that this cause be reassigned for argument on Monday, November 20th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Appellant,
382 vs.
A. D. Watts and A. D. Watts as Commissioner of Revenue of the State of North Carolina, et al.

IT IS ORDERED BY THIS COURT that this cause be reassigned for argument on Monday, November 20th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Norfolk Southern Railroad Company, Appellant,
383 vs.
A. D. Watts and A. D. Watts as Commissioner of Revenue, et al.

IT IS ORDERED BY THIS COURT that this cause be reassigned for argument on Monday, November 20th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Georgia Railway & Power Company et al., Appellants,
298 vs.
Railroad Commission of the State of Georgia et al.

IT IS ORDERED BY THIS COURT that this cause be reassigned for argument on Monday, November 27th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. I. Porterfield et al., Appellants,
299 vs.
U. S. Webb, Attorney General of the State of California, et al.;
and
U. S. Webb, as Attorney General of the State of California, et al., Appellants,
267 vs.
J. J. O'Brien et al.

IT IS ORDERED BY THIS COURT that these causes be reassigned for argument on Monday, November 27th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James L. Brooks
197 vs.
The United States of America.

IT IS ORDERED BY THIS COURT that this cause be reassigned for argument on Monday, November 27th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,
403 vs.
George Remus et al., etc.

IT IS ORDERED BY THIS COURT that this cause be reassigned for argument on Monday, November 27th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Blamberg Brothers, Appellant,
165 vs.
The United States of America.

IT IS ORDERED BY THIS COURT that this cause be reassigned for argument on Monday, December 4th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
407 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 22nd next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
394 vs.
George F. Benedict, Trustee, etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 22nd next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United States Grain Corporation, Plaintiff in Error,
290 vs.
Wallace B. Phillips.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 22nd next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pennsylvania Coal Company, Plaintiff in Error,
549 vs.
H. J. Mahon et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 13th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oliver Iron Mining Company, Appellant,
560 vs.
Samuel Lord et al.;

Cleveland-Cliffs Iron Company,
Appellant,
561 vs.
Samuel Lord et al.;

Mesaba-Cliffs Iron Mining Company,
Appellant,
562 vs.
Samuel Lord et al.;

Bennett Mining Company et al.,
Appellants,
563 vs.
Samuel Lord et al.;

Republic Iron & Steel Company
et al., Appellants,
564 vs.
Samuel Lord et al.;

The Biwabik Mining Company et al.,
Appellants,
565 vs.
Samuel Lord et al.; and

Inter-State Iron Company, Appellant,
566 vs.
Samuel Lord et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance these causes, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the causes assigned for argument on Monday, November 13th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Roland C. Heisler, Plaintiff in Error,
541 vs.
Thomas Colliery Company et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 13th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oklahoma Gas & Electric Company
et al., Appellants,
419 vs.
Corporation Commission of the
State of Oklahoma et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby,

granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 19th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oklahoma Natural Gas Company, Appellant,
406 vs.
Campbell Russell et al., constituting the Corporation Commission of Oklahoma et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 19th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arkansas Natural Gas Company, Appellant,
500 vs.
Arkansas Railroad Commission et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 19th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William A. Prendergast et al. constituting the Public Service Commission of the State of New York, et al., Appellants,
542 vs.
New York Telephone Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 19th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The City of New York, Appellant,
588 vs.
New York Telephone Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 19th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank Terrace and Elizabeth Terrace, his wife, et al., Appellants,
302 vs.
Lindsey L. Thompson, Attorney General of the State of Washington.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument with Nos. 299 and 267, heretofore assigned for Monday, November 27th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Keller et al., constituting the Board of Public Utility Commissioners of the District of Columbia,
Appellants,
260 vs.
Potomac Electric Power Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Capitol Life Insurance Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
43 vs.
Mary C. Ross.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file affidavit and certificates in this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts,
Complainant,
--- Orig'l. vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein, IT IS NOW HERE ORDERED BY THIS COURT that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and that process issue returnable on Monday, January 2, 1923.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Seth Gettys and John Prescott,
a partnership doing business under the style and firm name of Gettys and Prescott, Plaintiffs in Error,
183 vs.
Silvan Newburger, Joseph Newburger, Joseph Leopold, et al.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Altitude Oil Company,
Plaintiff in Error,

312 vs. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of
The People of the State of Colorado.
Colorado.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Trustees of the United States-Mexico Oil Company, Plaintiffs in Error, In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

323 vs.

T. W. Harris.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mildred McIntosh, Plaintiff in Error, In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

386 vs.

W. H. Dill and M. E. Dill.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry F. Mueller et al., Appellants, Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri.

376 vs.

Samuel W. Adler et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from

the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Peoples' Development Company, Appellant, vs. Southern Pacific Company, Southern Pacific Railroad Company of California, Homer S. King, et al., Trustees, et al.

304 Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Connors, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The People of the State of Illinois.

6 In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward O'Donnell, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The People of the State of Illinois.

7 In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Leonard Banks et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The People of the State of Illinois. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

8

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank Bender, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The People of the State of Illinois. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

9

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Boone, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The People of the State of Illinois. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

10

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Taglia, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The People of the State of Illinois. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

11

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Abe Schaffner, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The People of the State of Illinois. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

23

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George Moran, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The People of the State of Illinois. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

57

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Monday, October 9th, 1922, continued.

Walter Stephens, Plaintiff in Error, 89 vs. The People of the State of Illinois. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of Bacon Brothers Company, Petitioner. -- Original. ON CONSIDERATION of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus or a writ of prohibition herein,

IT IS NOW HERE ORDERED BY THIS COURT that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Toledo Scale Company, Petitioner, 339 vs. The Computing Scale Company. ON CONSIDERATION of the motion for leave to take testimony herein,

IT IS NOW HERE ORDERED BY THIS COURT that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, without prejudice to the making of such an application to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. Trinidad, as Insular Collector of Internal Revenue of the Philippine Islands, Petitioner, 423 vs. Sagrada Orden de Predicatores de la Provincia del Santissimo Rosario de Filipinas. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

American Railway Express Company, Petitioner,
424 vs.
Lucius P. Levee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to The Court of Appeal, First Circuit, of the State of Louisiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to The Court of Appeal, First Circuit, of the State of Louisiana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Pusey & Jones Company, Petitioner,
431 vs.
Hans Karluf Hanssen.

On petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. B. Giles et al., Petitioners,
443 vs.
Henry Vette et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Trustees of the United States-Mexico Oil Company, Plaintiff in Error,
323 vs.
T. W. Harris.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mildred McIntosh, Plaintiff in Error,
386 vs.
W. H. Dill et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ludwig Wolfgram,
Petitioner,
397 vs.
Ritchie T. Marsh,
Trustee, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Albert Rowan et al.,
Petitioners,
398 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads,
Petitioner,
399 vs.
William R. Coyle, Trustee, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the

United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William S. Livezey, Petitioner,
401 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Morris Reinstein et al.,
Petitioners,
405 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Can Company, Petitioner,
411 vs.
Frank Funkhauser.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Can Company, Petitioner,
412 vs.
M. T. McGoldrick.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that

the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Can Company, Petitioner, vs. Samuel J. Wilson. 413

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Can Company, Petitioner, vs. R. B. Rice et al. 414

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Can Company, Petitioner, vs. P. J. Garnett. 415

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Can Company, Petitioner, vs. Ralph Robinson. 416

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of

the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Can Company, Petitioner, vs. J. W. Burgan. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

417

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

R. D. James, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

420

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, etc., Petitioner, vs. Ellis R. Hyde. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

425

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Western Machinery Company et al., Petitioners, vs. Richfield Oil Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

427

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argu-

said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

King Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
434 vs.
P. H. Faulconer.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company,
Petitioner,
437 vs.
Samuel D. Eisenhart.

On petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Albert Hirshheimer,
Petitioner,
438 vs.
Ralph B. Hartsough et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Benjamin F. Haney,
Petitioner,
439 vs.
Ralph B. Hartsough et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to

the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

H. P. Converse et al., Petitioners, vs. Portsmouth Cotton Oil Refining Company. 441

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Champion Fibre Company, Petitioner, vs. The Pigeon River Railway Company. 445

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. L. Albright, Petitioner, vs. James C. Davis, Director General and Agent, etc. 446

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Sixth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Sixth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mrs. Eugenia Brooks, Administratrix of R. B. Brooks, deceased, Petitioner, vs. Seaboard Air Line Company. 337

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied, because of failure to submit the petition within the time prescribed by the rule.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The New York Central Railroad Company, Petitioner,
433 vs.
Middleport Gas & Electric Light Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied, because of failure to file the petition within the time prescribed by the statute.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Land Bank of New Orleans, Plaintiff in Error,
428 vs.
D. W. Crossland, Judge of Probate.

IT IS ORDERED BY THIS COURT that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Russell Motor Car Company, Appellant,
485 vs.
The United States.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee.

Layne & Bowler Corporation, Petitioner,
278 vs.
Western Well Works (Inc.) et al.

The motion for leave to file brief herein as amicus curiae, and for leave to take part in the oral argument, was submitted by Mr. D. P. Wolhaupter in that behalf.

The City of Trenton, Plaintiff in Error,
430 vs.
The State of New Jersey.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Newcorn in that behalf.

The City of Newark, Plaintiff in Error,
469 vs.
The State of New Jersey.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Newcorn in that behalf.

Isadore Glans et al., Petitioners,
473 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jerry C. South in behalf of Mr. Edmund K. Trent, Mr. Joseph P. Tumulty, and Mr. Charles H. Baker for the petitioners.

Benjamin B. Kaufmann et al., Petitioners,
596 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Elijah N. Zoline for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Louis Weiss, Petitioner,
641 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solomon P. Roderick for the petitioner.

George P. Ponder, Plaintiff in Error,
42 vs.
The State of Georgia.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Capitol Life Insurance Company, Plaintiff in Error,
43 vs.
Mary C. Ross.

This case was submitted by Mr. Jules C. Rosenberger, Mr. James C. Jones, Mr. Frank H. Sullivan, and Mr. James C. Jones, Jr., for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. James M. Johnson for the defendant in error.

The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Company, Petitioner,
35 vs.
David Fruchter, an infant, etc.; and
The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Company, Petitioner,
36 vs.
Sam Fruchter.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. James W. Carpenter for the petitioner, by Mr. Harold R. Medina for the respondents, and was concluded by Mr. James W. Carpenter for the petitioner.

The United States of America,
40 vs.
Oregon Lumber Company et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Riter for the United States, and by Mr. W. Lair Thompson for the Oregon Lumber Company et al.

The People of the State of New York ex rel. the Pierce-Arrow Motor Car Company, Plaintiff in Error,
41 vs.
Walter H. Knapp et al., as Members of the State Tax Commission, et al.

On motion of Mr. Charles P. Spooner in that behalf, two counsel were allowed to be heard for the plaintiff in error. This case was argued by Mr. Charles P. Spooner and Mr. Ansley W. Sawyer for the plaintiff in error, and was submitted by Mr. C. T. Dawes for the defendants in error.

Interstate Commerce Commission, Plaintiff in Error,
245 vs.
The United States of America ex rel. Members of the Waste Merchants

Association of New York, etc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. P. J. Farrell for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert P. Parrott, it is ordered that Stephen Ralph Tiffany, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Ira B. Mills, et al., Appellants, vs. Northern Pacific Railway Company et al. 48

On motion of Mr. P. J. Farrell in behalf of counsel, who suggested the death of Ira B. Mills, it was ordered that Ivan Bowen, his successor as a member of the Board of Railroad and Warehouse Commissioners, be substituted as a party appellant herein.

James C. Davis, Agent, etc., Petitioner, vs. Harold Preston. 448

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Circuit Court of Jackson County, State of Missouri.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered by this Court, that the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ivan Bowen et al., Appellants, 48 vs. Northern Pacific Railway Company et al.	This case was submitted by Mr. Clifford L. Hilton and Mr. Henry C. Flannery for the appellants, and by Mr. Charles W. Bunn, Mr. Dennis F. Lyons and Mr. Benjamin W. Scandrett for the appellees.
Railroad and Warehouse Commission of Minnesota et al., Appellants, 49 vs. Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Railway Company.	This case was submitted by Mr. Clifford L. Hilton and Mr. Henry C. Flannery for the appellants, and by Mr. Richard L. Kennedy, Mr. R. M. Van Doren, Mr. James B. Sheean, and Mr. F. W. Sargent for the appellee.
Railroad and Warehouse Commission of Minnesota et al., Appellants, 50 vs. Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company.	This case was submitted by Mr. Clifford L. Hilton and Mr. Henry C. Flannery for the appellants, and by Mr. Richard L. Kennedy, Mr. R. M. Van Doren, Mr. James B. Sheean, and Mr. F. W. Sargent for the appellee.
Interstate Commerce Commission, Plaintiff in Error, 245 vs. The United States of America ex rel. Members of the Waste Merchants Association of New York, etc.	The argument of this case was continued by Mr. P. H. Marshall for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. P. J. Farrell for the plaintiff in error.
R. W. Bratton et al., Appellants, 239 vs. William C. Chandler et al., etc., et al.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. M. M. Neill for the appellants, continued by Mr. Elias Gates for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. W. W. McChesney for the appellants.
H. H. Bohning, Plaintiff in Error, 181 vs. The State of Ohio; and Emil Pohl, Plaintiff in Error, 182 vs. The State of Ohio.	The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Timothy S. Hogan for the plaintiffs in error, continued by Mr. E. J. Thobaden for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., for the plaintiff in error.

The United States,
Petitioner,
76 vs.
Wesley L. Sischo.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. A. A. Wheat for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, October 11th, 1922,

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas Beckett, it is ordered that James Foster Henry, Esquire, of Clinton, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph M. Hill, it is ordered that Joseph Real Brown, Esquire, of Fort Smith, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alonzo B. Irvine, it is ordered that William Henry Folland, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage, it is ordered that Clyde H. Jones, Esquire, of La Fayette, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Benjamin B. Pottus, it is ordered that Harry William Hart, Esquire, of Wichita, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles L.

McNary, it is ordered that Custer E. Ross, Esquire, of Silverton, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Sarah P. Donley, Plaintiff in Error, 55 vs. Erwin Ray Van Horn.

This case was submitted by Mr. A. Haines for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. John M. Sutton and Mr. Charles R. Pierce for the defendant in error.

Sarah P. Donley, Plaintiff in Error, 56 vs. Prescott West.

This case was submitted by Mr. A. Haines for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. John M. Sutton and Mr. Charles R. Pierce for the defendant in error.

The United States, Petitioner, 76 vs. Wesley L. Sischo.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. A. A. Wheat for the petitioner, and the case submitted by Cletus Keating, as amicus curiae.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, 44 vs. Wong Sing.

This case was argued by Mr. A. A. Wheat for the plaintiff in error. There was no appearance for the defendant in error.

The United States of America, Appellant, 45 vs. Minnie Atkins et al.; and Nancy Atkins et al., Appellants, 46 vs. The United States of America et al.

On motion of Mr. J. M. Hill, Mr. H. L. Underwood and Mr. C. B. Stuart in that behalf, four and one-half hours were allowed for the argument of these cases. The argument was commenced by Mr. H.L. Underwood for the United States, and continued by Mr. J. M. Hill for Nancy Atkins et al.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, October 12th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. M. Kenyon, it is ordered that Earl B. Barnes, Esquire, of Kokomo, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that James S. Beacom, Esquire, of Greensburg, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George T. Farrell, it is ordered that Allen J. Seney, Esquire, and Roy R. Stuart, Esquire, of Toledo, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

West Side Irrigating Company,
Appellant,
54 vs.
The United States.

On motion of Mr. Assistant Attorney General Riter for the appellee, this case was passed for settlement.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts,
Complainant,
20, Original. vs.
The State of New York.

On motion of Mr. Frederick S. Tyler in that behalf, leave was granted to file answer of nine defendants herein.

First National Bank of Council Bluffs, Iowa, etc., Appellant,
62 vs.
J. D. Harman, County Auditor, etc., et al.

This case was continued, per stipulation of counsel.

The United States, Appellant,
45 vs.
Minnie Atkins et al.; and
Nancy Atkins et al., Appellants,
46 vs.
The United States et al.

The argument herein was continued by Mr. C. B. Stuart for Minnie Atkins et al., and concluded by Mr. H. L. Underwood for The United States.

John W. Keogh, Plaintiff in Error,
51 vs.
Chicago & North Western Railway Company et al.

This case was argued by Mr. H. P. Young for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Bruce Scott for the defendants in error.

Commissioners of the Land Office of the State of Oklahoma, et al., Appellants,
53 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and the appellants having been three times solemnly called by the Marshal to come into Court and prosecute their appeal, and failing to appear, it is, thereupon, in pursuance of the 16th rule of this Court, now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Brewer-Elliott Oil & Gas Company et al., Appellants,

52 vs.

The United States et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. W. A. Ledbetter for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, October 13th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland. Associate Justices.
Frank H. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. T. Michener, it is ordered that Charles C. Sullivan, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. S. Flannery, it is ordered that Walter K. Sharpe, Esquire, of Chambersburg, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

School District of the Borough of Greensburg, Plaintiff in Error,
63 vs.
S. T. Lopes et al.

This case was continued, per stipulation of counsel.

Brewer-Elliott Oil & Gas Company et al., Appellants,
52 vs.
The United States et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. W. A. Ledbetter for the appellants, and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Ritter for the appellees.

Keokuk & Hamilton Bridge Company, Appellant,

58 vs.

The United States.

This case was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee, and the case submitted by Mr. Felix T. Hughes for the appellant.

Gaston, Williams & Wigmore of Canada (Ltd.), petitioner,
59 vs.
Philip A. Warner.

This case was argued by Mr. Cletus Keating for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. P. Nolan for the respondent.

Southern Lighterage & Wrecking Company, Appellant,
60 vs.
The United States.

This case was argued by Mr. Joseph M. Hault for the appellee, and the case submitted by Mr. E. Howard McCaleb for the appellant.

James S. McKee et al., Petitioners,
61 vs.
Benjamin Gratz.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. S. M. Wallace for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, October 16th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. H. Sears, it is ordered that William M. Goldweber, Esquire, of Bayonne, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rudolph H. Yeatman, it is ordered that R. E. Wellford, Esquire, and Thomas A. Lane, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Morris M. Wilder, Esquire, of Meriden, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward S. Brashears, it is ordered that George H. P. Shaw, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Conrad H. Syme, it is ordered that Tench T. Marye, Esquire , of Washington, District of Columbia, and Albert B. Maris, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert L. Hopkins, it is ordered that Thomas McCall, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this

Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham, it is ordered that Joseph F. Eshelman, Esquire, of Inglewood, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tracy L. Jeffords, it is ordered that Don R. Hutchison, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert H. Lovett, it is ordered that William T. Stockton, Esquire, and Herman Ulmer, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles F. Wilson, it is ordered that John S. Benz, Esquire, of Miami, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Wilmer Latimer, it is ordered that William E. Egan, Esquire, of Hartford, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George M. Morris, it is ordered that John J. McDonald, Esquire, of Manchester, State of New Hampshire, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

North Carolina Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Evelyn K. Lee, Administratrix of Hugh Scott Lee, deceased. — On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

33

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this

Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

William W. Knights, Plaintiff in Error, vs. James Jackson, Treasurer and Receiver General. In Error to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts.

167

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Judicial Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Charlotte Harbor and Northern Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. W. G. Welles et al., as and constituting the Board of County Commissioners of De Soto County, Florida. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

4

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Florida, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Ephraim Lederer, Collector of Internal Revenue for the First District of Pennsylvania, Petitioner,

16 vs.
Alexander D. Stockton, Sole
Surviving Trustee under the
Will of Alexander J. Derbyshire,
deceased.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs and interest at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the courts of the State of Pennsylvania; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

The City of Trenton, Plaintiff in Error,
430 vs.
The State of New Jersey.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 26th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The City of Newark, Plaintiff in Error,
469 vs.
The State of New Jersey.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 26th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Russell Motor Car Company,
Appellant,
485 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause

assigned for argument on Monday, March 26th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oliver Iron Mining Company,
Appellant,
560 vs.
Samuel Lord et al.;
Cleveland-Cliffs Iron
Company, Appellant,
561 vs.
Samuel Lord et al.;
Mesaba-Cliffs Iron Mining
Company, Appellant,
562 vs.
Samuel Lord et al.;
Bennett Mining Company
et al., Appellants,
563 vs.
Samuel Lord et al.;
Republic Iron & Steel
Company et al., Appellants,
564 vs.
Samuel Lord et al;
The Biwabik Mining Company
et al., Appellants,
565 vs.
Samuel Lord et al.;
and
Inter-State Iron Company,
Appellant,
566 vs.
Samuel Lord et al.

Department of Trade and
Commerce of the State of
Nebraska et al., Appellants,

IT IS ORDERED BY THIS COURT that these cases be reassigned for argument on Monday, December 4th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

557 vs.

A. J. Hertz and John I. Levin, as Receivers of the Lion Bonding & Surety Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The People of the State of New York ex rel. The Pierce-Arrow Motor Car Company, Plaintiff in Error,

41 vs.

Walter H. Knapp et al., as Members of State Tax Commission, and The State Tax Commission.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs and interest at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the Courts of the State of New York.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ivan Bowen, Ole P. B. Jacobson, Fred W. Putnam, and Clifford L. Hilton, Appellants,

48 vs.

Northern Pacific Railway Company et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota, and was

argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Railroad and Warehouse
Commission of Minnesota
et al., Appellants,
49 vs.
Chicago, St. Paul,
Minneapolis & Omaha Rail-
way Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Railroad and Warehouse
Commission of Minnesota
et al., Appellants,
50 vs.
Chicago and North Western
Railway Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sarah F. Donley,
Plaintiff in Error,
55 vs.
Erwin Ray Van Horn.

In Error to the District Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Second Division, of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Second Division, of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sarah F. Donley,
Plaintiff in Error,
56 vs.
Prescott West.

In Error to the District Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Second Division, of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Second Division, of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
76 vs.
Wesley L. Sischo.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, the Court being equally divided in opinion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Layne & Bowler Corporation,
Petitioner,
278 vs.
Western Well Works, Inc., et al.

On consideration of the motion of Mr. D. P. Wolhaupter for leave to file a brief as amicus curiae herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that

the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and that leave to make oral argument herein be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York, Petitioner, 454 vs. Hurni Packing Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Petitioner, 457 vs. Frederick L. Merriam. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Petitioner, 458 vs. Henry B. Anderson. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, etc., Petitioner, 462 vs. George Wechsler. — On petition for writ of certiorari to The Kansas City Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Kansas City Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Department of Trade and Commerce of the State of Nebraska et al., Petitioners, vs. A. J. Hertz et al., Receivers, etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

467

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lion Bonding & Surety Company, Petitioner, vs. A. H. Karatz. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

574

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, as Agent, etc., Petitioner, vs. Lee A. Wolfe. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

468

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Canute Steamship Company, Limited, et al., Petitioners, vs.

471

Pittsburgh & West Virginia
Coal Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Salem Trust Company,
Petitioner,
474 vs.
Manufacturers' Finance
Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Theodore A. Heyer, doing
business as T. A. Heyer
Duplicator Company,
Petitioner,
476 vs.
Duplicator Manufacturing
Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles L. Craig,
Petitioner,
488 vs.
William C. Hecht, U. S.
Marshal.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Matthew Addy Company, Petitioner,
494 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Benjamin N. Ford, Petitioner,
495 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry P. Reed et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
319 vs.
Village of Hibbing et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles C. Binderup, Petitioner,
449 vs.
Pathe Exchange, Inc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Guiseppe Moretti, Petitioner, vs. John Wiley, Marble City Quarry Company et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

455

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Shenango Furnace Company et al., Petitioners, vs. The Village of Buhl et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

460

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mobile Shipbuilding Company, Petitioner, vs. Federal Bridge & Structural Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

465

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ranger Refining & Pipe Line Company et al., Petitioners, vs. J. E. Dryden et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

466

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to

the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jess Shipley et al.,
Petitioners,
470 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Victor Talking Machine Company,
Petitioner,
475 vs.
The Starr Piano Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alabama & Vicksburg Railway Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
479 vs.
Louis F. Dennis.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Union Electric Welding Company,
Petitioner,
481 vs.
John P. Curry et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Foscaneanu Alexander et al., Petitioners, 486 vs. General Electric Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Producers Warehouse Association, Petitioner, 489 vs. Philippine National Bank. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. H. Riley, Petitioner, 490 vs. O. C. McRaney. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Beer, Sondheimer & Company, Inc., Petitioner, 493 vs. American & Cuban Steamship Line, Inc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George M. Embiricos, Petitioner, 496 vs. Stuyvesant Insurance Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced that the Court will take a recess from Monday, October 23rd, to Monday, November 13th next.

ORDER OF ALLOTMENT OF JUSTICES.

There having been an Associate Justice of this Court appointed since the adjournment of the last term,

IT IS ORDERED, That the following allotment be made of the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of this Court among the circuits, agreeably to the Act of Congress in such case made and provided, and that such allotment be entered of record, viz:

For the First Circuit, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Associate Justice.
For the Second Circuit, Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justice.
For the Third Circuit, Mahlon Pitney, Associate Justice.
For the Fourth Circuit, William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
For the Fifth Circuit, J. C. McReynolds, Associate Justice.
For the Sixth Circuit, William R. Day, Associate Justice.
For the Seventh Circuit, George Sutherland, Associate Justice.
For the Eighth Circuit, Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justice.
For the Ninth Circuit, Joseph McKenna, Associate Justice.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, 18, Original. vs. The State of Texas, defendant; The United States of America, Intervener. — Leave was granted to file suggestions of the United States as to changes in Red River occurring since the taking of proofs, on motion of Mr. Assistant Attorney General Riter for the United States, with leave to the State of Texas to file objections on or before Friday next, on motion of Mr. R. H. Ward in that behalf.

I. W. Geer et al., 72 vs. The United States of America. — On motion of Mr. Assistant Attorney General Riter for the United States, this cause was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant

The United States of America, Complainant, ---Orig'l. vs. The State of Oklahoma.

The motion for leave to file Bill of Complaint herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Riter, Mr. Attorney General Daugherty and Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the complainant.

West Side Irrigating Company, Plaintiff in Error, 180 vs. Marvin Chase, as Hydraulic Engineer of the State of Washington, et al.

The motion to dismiss the writ of error in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Conrad H. Syme in behalf of Mr. L.L. Thompson for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. John P. Hartman for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

L. Vogelstein & Company, (Inc.), Appellant, 269 vs. The United States.

The motion to remand this case to the Court of Claims for further findings was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John S. Flannery for the appellant, with leave to the appellee to file objections thereto on or before Friday next, on motion of Mr. Assistant Attorney General Riter in that behalf.

R. H. Arnold, doing business as R. H. Arnold Company, et al., Plaintiffs in Error, 320 vs. The United States of America for the use of W.B. Guimarin & Company.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. O'B. Cooper in behalf of Mr. Frank C. Tompkins and Mr. M. C. McDonald for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Elwood P. Morey, Mr. William Henry White, and Mr. John I. Cosgrove for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Georgia Railway & Power Company et al., Appellants, 298 vs. Railroad Commission of the State of Georgia et al.

On motion of Mr. Abram F. Myers in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief herein as amicus curiae.

Joseph W. Cox, Appellant, 71 vs. Ethel Hart.

On motion of Mr. Eugene W. Britt in that behalf, this case was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

The State of Louisiana et al.,
Appellants,
286 vs.
J. D. O'Keefe, Receiver of the New Orleans Railway & Light Company, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellants to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Onepiece Bifocal Lens Company,
Petitioner,
590 vs.
Harold J. Stead, doing business as H. J. Stead Optical Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. V. H. Lockwood for the petitioner, and by Mr. Howard P. Denison for the respondent.

Graciano L. Cabrera et al.,
Petitioners,
597 vs.
The People of the Philippine Islands.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Adam C. Carson for the petitioners, and by Mr. Grant T. Trent and Mr. Logan M. Rock for the respondent.

Fred M. Harden, Petitioner,
599 vs.
Manuel Arias Rodriguez et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clement L. Bouve for the petitioner, and by Mr. Alexander Britton and Mr. Lawrence H. Cake in opposition thereto.

Pennsylvania Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
608 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Shirley Carter for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt in opposition thereto.

Aktieselskabet Fido, Petitioner,
613 vs.
The Lloyd Brasileiro et al.;

Aktieselskabet Fido,

Petitioner,

614 vs.

Cano, Moore & Company,Inc.;

Aktieselskabet Christianssand,

Petitioner,

615 vs.

Cia Commercio e Navagacao

Company et al.;

Aktieselskabet Christianssand,

Petitioner,

616 vs.

Cano, Moore & Company, Inc.;

Skibsaktien Glommen,

Petitioner,

617 vs.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Coal

& Coke Company et al.;

Skibsaktien Glommen,

Petitioner,

618 vs.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Coal

& Coke Company et al.;

Skibsaktien Clyde,

Petitioner,

619 vs.

John S. Sorenson et al.;

Skibsaktien Clyde,

Petitioner,

620 vs.

John S. Sorenson et al.;

Bechs Rederi Aktien,

Petitioner,

621 vs.

The American Coal Exporting

Company et al.;

Bechs Rederi Aktien,

622 vs.
The American Coal Exporting Company;
Christianssand Shipping Company,
Limited, Petitioner,
623 vs.
The American Coal Exporting Company
et al.;
Christianssand Shipping Company,
Limited, Petitioner,
624 vs.
The American Coal Exporting Company;
Aktieselskabet Christianssand,
Petitioner,
625 vs.
Berwind-White Coal Mining Company;
and
Aktieselskabet Christianssand,
Petitioner,
626 vs.
Berwind-White Coal Mining Company.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles S. Haight, Mr. John W. Griffin, and Mr. Wharton Poor for the petitioners, and by Mr. John M. Woolsey, Mr. Delbert M. Tibbetts, Mr. Charles C. Burlingham and Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper for the respondents.

The Trusts and Guarantee Company (Limited), Executor, etc., Petitioner,
631 vs.
The Hoosier Veneer Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George T. Buckingham and Mr. Marquis Eaton for the petitioners, and by Mr. H. P. Young in opposition thereto.

James S. McKee et al., Petitioners,
61 vs.
Benjamin Gratz.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. S. Mayner Wallace for Gratz, by Mr. Lon O. Hocker for McKee et al., and concluded by Mr. S. Mayner Wallace for Gratz.

Thomas F. E. Ryan,
Appellant,
64 vs.
The United States.

This case was argued by Mr. William E. Russell for the appellant, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Lovett for the appellee.

Robert J. Gaffney et al.,
Appellants,
65 vs.
James M. Hoyt et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and the appellants having been three times solemnly called by the Marshal to come into Court and prosecute their appeal, and failing to appear, it is, thereupon, in pursuance of the 16th rule of this Court, and on the motion of Mr. Louis A. Stebbins, of counsel for the appellees, now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, etc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
66 vs.
Cora I. Baechtel et al.

This case was submitted by Mr. Henry H. Keedy, Jr., Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, and Mr. John S. Flannery for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Elias B. Hartle for the defendant in error.

The State of Ohio ex rel. Allen J. Seney, Prosecuting Attorney, etc., Appellant,
67 vs.
Swift &Company et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Allen J. Seney for the appellant, and by Mr. H. W. Fraser for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, October 17th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis S. Maguire, it is ordered that Amasa M. Holcombe, Esquire, and Frank O. Parker, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. M. MacDowell, it is ordered that Florentino Pamintuan, Esquire, of Chevy Chase, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul E. Lesh, it is ordered that Clarence A. O'Brien, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Morganston, it is ordered that William L. Clay, Esquire, of Rochester, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Gustave Lemle, it is ordered that Ivy G. Kittredge, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
18, Original. vs.

The State of Texas, Defendant;
The United States, Intervener.

The stipulation of the United States and other interveners as to lands within the Receivership area was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the United States.

The State of New York, Complainant, 22, Original. vs. Harry M. Daugherty, Attorney General, et al.

The motion to dismiss the bill of complaint herein was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the defendants in support of the motion.

The United States, Appellant, 47 vs. Western Union Telegraph Company.

The stipulation and suggestion as to decree herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellant.

Thomas J. Stockley et al., Appellants, 74 vs. The United States.

This case was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

Dharamdas Tulsidas et al., Petitioners, 77 vs. Insular Collector of Customs.

On motion of Mr. Logan M. Rock for the respondent, this case was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

Snake Creek Mining & Tunnel Company, Petitioner, 68 vs. Midway Irrigation Company et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. H. R. McMillan for the petitioner, continued by Mr. A. B. Irvine, and concluded by Mr. William H. Folland for the respondent.

The United States, Plaintiff in Error, 69 vs. Raymond H. Bowman.

This case was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the plaintiff in error. There was no appearance for the defendant in error.

Tuesday, October 17th, 1922, continued.

Porto Rico Railway, Light & Power Company, Appellant,

70 vs.

Manuel Camunas et al., etc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Carroll G. Walter for the appellant and continued by Mr. Grant T. Trent and Mr. Logan N. Rock for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, October 18th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. R. Prince, it is ordered that Clarence Ogden Amonette, Esquire, of Lynchburg, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl A. Mapes, it is ordered that McKenzie Moss, Esquire, of Bowling Green, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The American Railway Express Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Commonwealth of Kentucky.

It is ordered that this case be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

Porto Rico Railway, Light & Power Company, Appellant,
70 vs.
Manuel Camunas et al., etc., et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Logan N. Hock for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Carroll G. Walter for the appellant.

Carleton Hunt et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
73 vs.
The City of New Orleans et al.

The death of Carleton Hunt was suggested, and Thomas Hunt, Robert Hunt, and Edward Livingston Hunt, heirs at law of Carleton Hunt, deceased, were substituted as parties plaintiffs in error herein, on motion of Mr.

Charles Louque for the plaintiffs in error.

Thomas Hunt et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
73 vs.
The City of New Orleans et al.

On motion of Mr. Henry H. Chaffe for the defendants in error, three counsel were allowed to argue for the defendants in error. The argument was commenced by Mr. Charles Louque for the plaintiffs in error, continued by Mr. Gustave Lemle for the Illinois Central Railroad Company, by Mr. Ivy G. Kittredge for the City of New Orleans, and by Mr. Henry H. Chaffe for the Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company et al., and concluded by Mr. Charles Louque for the plaintiffs in error. Leave was granted plaintiffs in error to file additional brief in one week.

Ortega Company, Appellant,
75 vs.
E. J. Triay, as Receiver, etc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Herman Ulmer for the appellant, and continued by Mr. Peter O. Knight for the appellee, and continued by Mr. W. T. Stockton for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, October 19th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day,

Willis Van Devanter,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

George Sutherland,

Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. O. E. Harrison, it is ordered that Fred L. Carhart, Esquire, of Marion, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Karl Knox Gartner, it is ordered that Ralph H. Cake, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, Thomas Renaud Rutter, Esquire, of Springfield, State of Illinois, and John A. Selby, Esquire, of Snow Hill, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Leahy, it is ordered that Louis Lofko, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Benjamin B. Pettus, it is ordered that Marcellus D. R. Ramsey, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

James C. Davis, Director General, etc., Plaintiff in Error,

85 vs.

J. J. Smith, Jr., Administrator, etc.

It is ordered that this case be passed to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner,

86 vs.

On motion of Mr. A. A. Wheat for the petitioner, it is ordered that this case be passed to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule

McLane Tilton, Appellant,
87 vs.
Felix M. Drennen, as Receiver, etc.

It is ordered that this case be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

Ortega Company, Appellant,
75 vs.
E. J. Triay, as Receiver, etc.

The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. W. T. Stockton for the appellant.

Southern Pacific Company et al., Petitioners,
78 vs.
Olympian Dredging Company.

This case was argued by Mr. William R. Harr for the petitioners, and by Mr. Thomas E. Haven for the respondent.

Frank Bruno, Appellant,
79 vs.
George E. Williams, Criminal Sheriff, etc.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

This cause being called for hearing on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana,

And no counsel appearing and no briefs having been filed for either party,

Therefore, in pursuance of the 18th Rule of this Court, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Duesenberg Motors Corporation, Appellant,
80 vs.
The United States.

This case was argued by Mr. George A. Ling for the appellant, and by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the appellee.

John P. Kline et al., etc., Petitioners,
81 vs.
Burke Construction Company.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. William H. Arnold for the petitioners.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, October 20th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland. Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Pierce, it is ordered that Samuel J. Barco, Esquire, of Miami, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, it is ordered that Leo V. Youngworth, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. B. McDonough, it is ordered that L. Clyde Going, Esquire, of Memphis, State of Tennessee, and Ira D. Oglesby, Esquire, of Fort Smith, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

John Ewen, Petitioner,
92 vs.
American Fidelity Company.

On motion of Mr. Henry E. Davis for the petitioner, it is ordered that this case be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to the provisions of Section 9 of Rule 26.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
18, Original. vs.
The State of Texas,

The United States, Intervenor.

On motion of Mr. R. H. Ward for the defendant, the objections of the State of Texas to the granting of permits to owners and lessees of certain lands were filed.

United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, Plaintiff in Error,
124 vs.
John E. Sullivan; and
United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, Petitioner,
93 vs.
John E. Sullivan.

On motion of Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the plaintiff in error and petitioner, it is ordered that these cases be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

John Simon, Appellant,
94 vs.
American Exchange National Bank et al.

On motion of Mr. Alfred A. Wheat in that behalf, it is ordered that this case be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

Louis Brownlow et al., Commissioners of the District of Columbia, et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
95 vs.
Mollie Schwartz.

It is ordered that this case be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

John P. Kline et al., etc., Petitioners,
81 vs.
Burke Construction Company.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. William H. Arnold for the petitioners, by Mr. J. B. McDonough for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. F. S. Quinn for the petitioners.

Baltimore & Ohio Southwestern Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,
83 vs.
W. H. Settle et al., etc.

This case was argued by Mr. George Hoadly for the plaintiff in error, and was submitted by Mr. Harry C. Barnes for the defendants in error.

Rosalyn Zucht, by her next friend, A. D. Zucht, Plaintiff in Error, 84 vs. W. A. King et al.	This case was argued by Mr. Don A. Bliss for the plaintiff in error, and was submitted by Mr. R.L. Ball and Mr. A. W. Scoligson for the defendants in error.
Fred Browne, Plaintiff in Error, 88 vs. Charles B. Thorn et al., etc.	This case was argued by Mr. James B. McDonough for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Ira D. Oglesby and Mr. L. C. Going for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, October 23rd, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

William R. Day, Associate Justices.

Willis Van Devanter,

Louis D. Brandeis,

George Sutherland.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham, it is ordered that J. Paul Kelley, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. O. W. Underwood, Jr., it is ordered that M. Manning Marcus, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Karl Knox Gartner, it is ordered that H. E. Hackney, Esquire, of Uniontown, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles C. Lancaster, it is ordered that Dilworth M. Silver, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jerry A. Mathews, it is ordered that Philip V. Mattes, Esquire, of Scranton, State of Pennsylvania, and Oscar A. Adel, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles F. Wilson,

it is ordered that Walter J. Guthrie, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James C. Davis, it is ordered that Edgar R. Harlan, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Interstate Commerce Commission,
Plaintiff in Error,
245 vs.
The United States of America ex rel. Members of the Waste Merchants Association of New York, Voluntary Association.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Edward F. Jackman,
Plaintiff in Error,
3 vs.
The Rosenbaum Company.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Wong Sing. — In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Utah.

44

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Utah, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Ex parte In the matter of Huey P. Long, Shelby Taylor, and Francis Williams, constituting the Louisiana Public Service Commission, and the Louisiana Public Service Commission, Petitioners. — On motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus.

--- Original.

The writ of mandamus asked in this motion relates to the granting of a supersedeas by the Judge of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana in the case of Cumberland Telephone & Telegraph Company, Appellant, vs. Louisiana Public Service Commission et al., No. 650 on the docket of this Court for the October Term, 1922. The Court considers the application for mandamus as a motion to set aside the supersedeas and injunction granted by the District Judge in the said case of Cumberland Telephone & Telegraph Company, Appellant, vs. Louisiana Public Service Commission et al., No. 650;

Therefore, on consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that cause be shown by Cumberland Telephone & Telegraph Company, on Monday, November 13th next, or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, why the supersedeas and injunction should not be set aside and the injunction dissolved.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Complainant, --- Original. vs. The State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Corona Coal Company, Appellant,

18 vs.

Southern Railway Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Alabama.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Alabama, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Lighterage & Wrecking Company, Appellant,

60 vs.

The United States of America.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, the Court being equally divided in opinion, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

West Side Irrigating Company, Plaintiff in Error,

180 vs.

Marvin Chase, as Hydraulic Engineer of the State of Washington, et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this

Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Capitol Life Insurance Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Mary C. Ross. 43

In Error to the Kansas City Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Kansas City Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, operating the Cumberland Valley Railroad, Employer, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Cena I. Buechtel, Nettie Preftakes, et al. 66

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Porto Rico Railway, Light & Power Company, Appellant, vs. Manuel Camunas et al., composing the Workmen's Relief Commission et al. 70

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas Hunt et al., heirs at law of Carleton Hunt, deceased, Plaintiffs in Error,
73 vs.
The City of New Orleans et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

L. Vogelstein & Company, Inc., Appellant,
269 vs.
The United States.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to remand this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

R. H. Arnold, doing business as R. H. Arnold Company, et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
320 vs.
The United States of America for the use of W. B. Guimarin & Company.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits. It is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, transferred to the summary docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of New York, Complainant,
22, Original. vs.
Harry M. Daugherty, Attorney General of the United States, et al.

It is ordered by this Court that the motion to dismiss the bill of complaint herein be, and the same is hereby, assigned for hearing on Tuesday, January 2d next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Appellant, vs. The Western Union Telegraph Company. — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

47

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to reverse the decree of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, in this cause, has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that the decree of the said Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York with directions to enter a decree dismissing the bill without prejudice and without costs to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel A. Myers et al., Petitioners, vs. International Trust Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Superior Court, County of Suffolk, Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

512

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court, County of Suffolk, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Board of Trade of the City of Chicago et al., Petitioners, vs. E. H. Johnson, Trustee, etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

513

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Webster Electric Company, Petitioner, vs.

520

Splitdorf Electrical Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Simon Hecht et al., Trustees,
Petitioners,
532 vs.
John F. Malley, Former Collector of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arthur L. Howard et al.,
Trustees, Petitioners,
533 vs.
John F. Malley, Former Collector of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arthur L. Howard et al.,
Trustees, Petitioners,
534 vs.
Andrew J. Casey, Former Acting Collector of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the

United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner,
535 vs.
Raymond Bros.-Clark Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Automatic Pencil Sharpener Company, Petitioner,
499 vs.
Boston Pencil Pointer Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry Goldberg et al., Petitioners,
501 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Andrew Jergens Company, Petitioner,
502 vs.
William A. Woodbury, Distributors, Inc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mrs. Essie Lee Jones, Administratrix, etc., Petitioner,
vs.
Central of Georgia Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia.

503

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Federal Agent of Railways, et al., etc., Petitioners,
vs.
Mrs. Walter Morgan, Administratrix, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas.

504

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Iyonmatsu Ukichi et al., Petitioners,
vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

505

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William T. Price et al., Petitioners,
506 vs.
Magnolia Petroleum Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Morgenstern & Company, Inc., Petitioner,
507 vs.
The Hoffman-La Roche Chemical Works, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ernest W. Hokemer, Petitioner,
508 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Farish Company, Petitioner,
514 vs.
South Side Trust Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ella Howey, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme
516 vs. Court of the State of Missouri.
William J. Howey.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sylvester Carollo, On petition for writ of certiorari to the United
Petitioner, States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth
517 vs. Circuit.
The United States of
America.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Clair D. Jones, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme
519 vs. Court of the State of Utah.
Inter-Mountain Life Insur-
ance Company et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Utah, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Woolwine Metal Products On petition for writ of certiorari to the United
Company, Petitioner, States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth
521 vs. Circuit.
Willis J. Boyle, Sr.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Manuel Biskind, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 523

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel Rembrandt, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 524

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Whiting Manufacturing Company, Petitioner, vs. Alvin Silver Company, Inc. 527

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry O. Phillips, Petitioner, vs. Pennsylvania Railroad Company. 531

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank P. Helm, Petitioner, vs. American Hawaiian Steamship Company. 538

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John G. Crosland, Petitioner,
539 vs.
Benjamin E. Dyson, U. S. Marshal, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Appellant,
510 vs.
Nelson W. Rider.

A motion to advance this cause was submitted to the by Mr. Assistant/Solicitor General Esterline for the appellant.

The Akron, Canton & Youngstown Railway Company et al., Appellants,
646 vs.
The United States of America et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted by Mr. Assistant to the Solicitor/ General Esterline for the appellees.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner,
637 vs.
Standard Oil Company (New Jersey);
Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner,
638 vs.
Gulf Refining Company; and
Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner,
639 vs.
Maloney Oil Manufacturing Company.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Assistant to the/Solicitor General Esterline, Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. W. H. Fuller, Mr. Adrien F. Busick, and Mr. Eugene D. Burr for the petitioner, and by Mr. C. D. Chamberlin, Mr. Hubert B. Fuller, Mr. Chester O. Swain, and Mr. James H. Hayes for the respondents.

Oklahoma Natural Gas Company, Appellant, 405 vs. Campbell Russell et al., etc.

The motion to reassign this case for argument was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. Mitchell Palmer in that behalf.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, 18, Original. vs. The State of Texas.

On motion of Mr. John S. Flannery in that behalf, the ninth report of the Receiver in this cause was filed.

Board of Levee Commissioners of The Orleans Levee District, Petitioner, 603 vs. William H. Ward.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Julius Henry Cohen and Mr. Arthur McGuirk for the petitioner, and by Mr. Benjamin T. Waldo and Mr. Walter L. Gleason for the respondent, with leave to counsel for the petitioner to file the record when printed.

The State of North Dakota, Complainant, 11, Original. vs. The State of Minnesota.

The motion for leave to open, file, and print record of additional testimony and assign cause for argument was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles B. Pierce for the defendant.

Border National Bank of Eagle Pass, Texas, Plaintiff in Error, 601 vs. American National Bank of San Francisco, California.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William M. Pardue for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition, and by Mr. S. J. Brooks and Mr. Walter P. Napier for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

St. Louis Electrical Works et al., Petitioners, 604 vs. Fore Electrical Manufacturing Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John H. Bruninga for the petitioners.

Hannah Canard Barnett et al., Appellants, 647 vs. W. A. Kunkel et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lewis C. Lawson, Mr. Francis Stewart, Mr. Malcolm R. Pearson

Mr. Joseph C. Stone, and Mr. Charles A. Moon for the appellants in support of the petition.

Border National Bank of Eagle Pass, Texas, Plaintiff in Error, vs. American National Bank of San Francisco, California.

The motion to dismiss the writ of error herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. J. Brooks and Mr. Walter P. Napier for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. William M. Pardue, Mr. H. Ralph Burton, and Mr. Tench T. Maryc for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

601

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, November 13th next, at 12 o'clock.

Monday, November 13th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices.

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

George Sutherland.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that Louie W. Strum, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida; David V. Cahill, Esquire, of New York City, and Adelbert P. Jenks, Esquire, of Albany, State of New York, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George W. Maxey, it is ordered that J. Julius Levy, Esquire, of Scranton, State of Pennsylvania, and Joseph E. Fleitz, Esquire, of Wilkes Barre, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. S. Flannery, it is ordered that F. Delano Putnam, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, and John A. Helldorfer, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Horace S. Whitman, it is ordered that Rose Weiss, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry S. Drinker, Jr., it is ordered that Clarence Valentine, Esquire, and Reese H. Harris, Esquire, of Scranton, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred D. Smith, it is ordered that John Murphy, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E. Alter, it is ordered that Emerson Collins, Esquire, of Williamsport, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. J. Scofield, it is ordered that Edward M. Burke, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Philip V. Mattes, it is ordered that Frank M. Walsh, Esquire, of Scranton, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jerry A. Mathews, it is ordered that Howard A. Lehman, of Bethlehem, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Davis, it is ordered that Edwin S. S. Sunderland, Esquire, and John Vance Hewitt, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Hayden Oliver, it is ordered that Walter L. Hill, Esquire, of Scranton, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis W. McKernan, it is ordered that Charles P. Stewart, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh H. Obear, it is ordered that Richard E. Preece, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. H. Carraway, it is ordered that T. W. Davis, Esquire, of Memphis, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Blanc Monroe, it is ordered that Huey P. Long, Esquire, of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Takao Ozawa, vs. The United States. — On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

1

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the questions certified must be answered as follows:

Question No. 1. The Act of June 29, 1906, is not complete in itself but is limited by Section 2169 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

Question No. 2. No.

Question No. 3. No.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Takuji Yamashita and Charles Hio Kono, Petitioners, vs. J. Grant Hinkle, as Secretary of State of the State of Washington. — On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

177

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby,

Gaston, Williams & Wigmore
of Canada, Limited,
Petitioner,
59 vs.
Philip A. Warner.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Southern Pacific Company
and California Pacific
Railroad Company,
Petitioners,
78 vs.
Olympian Dredging Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

John W. Keogh, Plaintiff in
Error,
51 vs.
Chicago & Northwestern
Railway Company et al.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the

United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Baltimore & Ohio Southwestern Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
83 vs.
W. H. Settle and George W. Clephane, Partners under the Firm Name and Style of W. H. Settle & Company.
In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Rosalyn Zucht, by her next friend, A. D. Zucht, Plaintiff in Error,
84 vs.
W. A. King et al.
In Error to the Court of Civil Appeals, Fourth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals, Fourth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

The New York, New Haven &
Hartford Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
35 vs.
David Fruchter, an Infant,
by Jennie Fruchter, his
Guardian ad litem.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The New York, New Haven
and Hartford Railroad
Company, Petitioner,
36 vs.
Sam Fruchter.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The State of Ohio ex rel.
Allen J. Seney, Prosecuting Attorney of Lucas
County, Ohio, Appellant,

67 vs.

Swift & Company and The Northern Refrigerating Company.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Transportes Maritimos do Estado, Claimant of S. S. "Sao Vincente", Petitioner,

279 vs.

Tietjen & Lang Drydock Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Transportes Maritimos do Estado, Claimant of S. S. "Murmugao", Petitioner,

280 vs.

Maxwell Rose, doing business, etc.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Monday, November 13th, 1922, continued.

Transportes Maritimos do Estado (in personam), Petitioner, vs. Maxwell Rose, doing business, etc.

281 — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Transportes Maritimos do Estado, as Claimant of S. S. "Murmugao", Petitioner, vs. Thomas de Simone.

282 — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Transportes Maritimos do Estado (in personam), Petitioner, vs. Thomas de Simone.

283 — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause, be, and the same is

hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Keokuk & Hamilton Bridge Company,
Appellant,
58 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.
The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

James S. McKee et al.,
Petitioners,
61 vs. On writ of certiorari to the United States
Benjamin Gratz. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

and on writ of certiorari
Fred Browne, Plaintiff in Error, In Error/to the United States Circuit
88 vs. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.
Charles B. Thorn, William T.
Maginnis, Samuel C. Coleman, and
Miles J. Kehoe, Partners, doing
business as Thorn & Maginnis.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Arkansas.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Ortega Company, Appellant,
75 vs.
E. J. Triay, as Receiver of the Jacksonville Traction Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

R. W. Bratten et al.,
Appellants,
239 vs.
William C. Chandler et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Tennessee.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Tennessee, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Duesenberg Motors Corporation,
Appellant,
80 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the

Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, 24 vs. Nye Schneider Fowler Company. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that so much of the state statute in question as imposed an attorney's fee upon the plaintiff in error in the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska is invalid, and that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, to that extent, be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and, in other respects, affirmed, with costs in this court to be taxed one-third to the defendant in error and two-thirds to the plaintiff in error; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Wichita Railroad & Light Company, Appellant, 27 vs. Public Utilities Commission of the State of Kansas et al. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Monday, November 13th, 1922, continued.

Eugene A. Freund and
Alfred F. Roemmich,
Appellants,
29 vs.
The United States.

Appeal and Cross-Appeal from the Court of Claims.

The United States,
Appellant,
37 vs.
Eugene A. Freund and
Alfred F. Roemmich.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, on appeal and cross-appeal, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Claims with directions to find the value of the services rendered by the appellants on the substituted or restated route, including a fair profit, and to enter judgment for the balance found due.

It is further ordered and adjudged by this Court that the cross-appeal of The United States be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

National Union Fire
Insurance Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
32 vs.
Robert Wanberg.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Brewer-Elliott Oil & Gas
Company et al.,
Appellants,
52 vs.

and Gypsy Oil Company.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas F. E. Ryan, Appellant,

64 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

69 vs.

Raymond H. Bowman.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions to overrule the demurrer and for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

The United States of

76 vs.
Wesley L. Sische.

On consideration of the petition for a rehearing in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, restored to the docket for hearing before a full Bench.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Appellant,
510 vs.
Nelson W. Rider.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 19th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Akron, Canton & Youngstown Railway Company et al.,
Appellants,
646 vs.
The United States of America et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 8th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oklahoma Natural Gas Company,
Appellant,
406 vs.
Campbell Russell et al.

On consideration of the motion to reassign this case,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of North Dakota,
Complainant,
11, Orig'l. vs.
The State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the motion for leave to open, file, and print additional testimony and to assign for argument,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said Motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 26th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Border National Bank of
Eagle Pass, Texas,
Plaintiff in Error,

601 vs.
American National Bank of San
Francisco, California.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Border National Bank of Eagle Pass, Texas, Plaintiff in Error,
601 vs.
American National Bank of San Francisco, California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania,
Complainant,
15, Orig'l. vs.
The State of West Virginia.
The State of Ohio, Complainant,
16, Orig'l. vs.
The State of West Virginia.

It is ordered by this Court that these cases be restored to the docket for reargument before a full Bench.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Eli Bunch, Plaintiff in Error,
328 vs.
J. B. Cole et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Power Company, Petitioner,
554 vs.
North Carolina Public Service Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court

argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Red Cross Line, Petitioner, vs. Atlantic Fruit Company. 568

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, as Agent, etc., Petitioner, vs. The Portland Seed Company. 573

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Baltimore & Ohio Southwestern Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Guerney O. Burtch. 577

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Queen Insurance Company of America, Petitioner, vs. Globe & Rutgers Fire Insurance Company. 579

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, as Agent, etc., Petitioner,
583 vs.
E. M. Matthews, Administrator, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alvah Crocker et al., Trustees, Petitioners,
587 vs.
John F. Malley, Collector, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomson Spot Welder Company, Petitioner,
589 vs.
Ford Motor Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner, vs. Standard Oil Company (New Jersey). 637

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner, vs. Gulf Refining Company. 638

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner, vs. Maloney Manufacturing Company. 639

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Isadore Glass et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 473

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to

the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

R. C. Wood et al., Petitioners, vs. F. C. Noyes, as Receiver, etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

540

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Standard Oil Company (Indiana), Petitioner, vs. James R. Henry. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana.

544

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cudahy Packing Company of Nebraska, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Mary Ann Parramore, as Widow and Guardian, etc., et al. — On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

547

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Standard Oil Company of Louisiana, Petitioner, vs. Roy P. Parham. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

548

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

B. F. Trappey & Sons, Petitioners, vs. McIlhenny Company. 553

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Farm Mortgage & Loan Company, Petitioner, vs. John R. Hazel, Judge, etc. 558

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel M. Grossman, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 559

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. H. Goff Company, Petitioner, vs. Lamborn & Company. 567

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that

the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Axel Matson, Petitioner,
580 vs.
Walker D. Hines, Director General of Railroads.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mary Jeannette McNamara et al., Petitioners,
582 vs.
John Hamilton McNamara, a minor, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ben Rudner et al., Petitioners,
584 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Bacon Brothers Company, Petitioner,
586 vs.
E. Frank Grable, Individually, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the

United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sulzberger & Sons Company, Petitioner, vs. Steamship "Hellig Olav" et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

592

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Benjamin B. Kaufmann et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

596

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Graciano L. Cabrera et al., Petitioners, vs. The People of the Philippine Islands. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

597

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Texas Company et al., Petitioners

598 vs.
Steamship "Santa Rita", etc.,
et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fred M. Harden, Petitioner,
599 vs.
Manuel Arias Rodriguez et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Pyle-National Company,
Petitioner,
600 vs.
Oliver Electric Manufacturing
Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

St. Louis Electrical Works et al.,
Petitioners,
604 vs.
Fore Electrical Manufacturing
Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the

argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mary Banks, Petitioner, vs. The State of Alabama. 605

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 608

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Merchant Marine Insurance Company of New York, Petitioner, vs. Liberty Sand & Gravel Company (Inc.) 609

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Aktieselskabet Fido, Petitioner, vs. The Lloyd Brazileiro et al. 613

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein

to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Aktieselskabet Fido, Petitioner,
614 vs.
Gano, Moore & Company (Inc.)

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Aktieselskabet Christianssand,
Petitioner,
615 vs.
Cia Commercio e Navegacao
Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Aktieselskabet Christianssand,
Petitioner,
616 vs.
Gano, Moore & Company (Inc.)

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Skibsaktiea Glommen, Petitioner,
617 vs.
The Chesapeake & Ohio Coal & Coke Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to

the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Skibsaktiea Glommen, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to the
618 vs. United States Circuit Court of Appeals for
The Chesapeake & Ohio Coal & the Second Circuit.
Coke Company.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Skibsaktiea Clyde, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to the
619 vs. United States Circuit Court of Appeals for
John S. Sorenson et al. the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Skibsaktiea Clyde, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to the
620 vs. United States Circuit Court of Appeals for
John S. Sorenson et al. the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Bachs Rederi Aktiea, On petition for writ of certiorari to the
Petitioner, United States Circuit Court of Appeals for
621 vs. the Second Circuit.
The American Coal Exporting
Company et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to

the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Bechs Rederi Aktiea, Petitioner, | On petition for writ of certiorari to
622 vs. | the United States Circuit Court of
The American Coal Exporting | Appeals for the Second Circuit.
Company.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Christianssand Shipping Company, Limited, Petitioner, | On petition for writ of certiorari
623 vs. | to the United States Circuit Court of
The American Coal Exporting | Appeals for the Second Circuit.
Company et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Christianssand Shipping Company, Limited, Petitioner, | On petition for writ of certiorari to
624 vs. | the United States Circuit Court of
The American Coal Exporting | Appeals for the Second Circuit.
Company.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Aktieselskabet Christianssand,
Petitioner,

625 vs.
Berwind-White Coal Mining
Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Aktieselskabet Christianssand, Petitioner,
626 vs.
Berwind-White Coal Mining
Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Trusts and Guarantee Company, Limited, Executor, etc., Petitioner,
631 vs.
Hoosier Veneer Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hannah Canard Barnett et al., Appellants,
647 vs.
W. A. Kunkel et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry E. DeKay, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

551

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied because of failure to file the petition within the time prescribed by the statute.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry Michelsohn, Petitioner, vs. Charles F. Dittmar, as Trustee, etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

571

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied because of failure to file the petition within the time prescribed by the statute.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Petitioner, vs. Lippmann, Spier & Hahn. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

578

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs Appeals, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied because of failure to file the petition within the time prescribed by the statute.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Simmons Hardware Company, Petitioner, vs. Southern Railway Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

611

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied because of failure to file the petition within the time prescribed by the statute.

Louis Weiss, Petitioner,
641 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied because of failure to file the petition within the time prescribed by the statute.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Walter S. Hallanan, State Tax Commissioner, et al.,
Petitioners,
569 vs.
The Eureka Pipe Line Company.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Walter S. Hallanan, State Tax Commissioner, etc.,
Plaintiff in Error and Petitioner,
570 vs.
United Fuel Gas Company.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,
127 vs.
Samuel Krohnberg et al.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
140 vs.
Charles Milanese.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Land Bank of New Orleans, Plaintiff in Error,
428 vs.
D. W. Crossland, Judge of Probate.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the plaintiff in error.

Margaret C. Lynch, Executrix of E. J. Lynch, Collector, etc.,
Petitioner,
655 vs.
Tilden Produce Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt and Mr. G. Noble Jones for the petitioner.

The Cunard Steam Ship Company, Limited, et al., Appellants,
659 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury, et al.;

The Oceanic Steam Navigation Company, Limited, Appellant,
660 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury, et al.;

International Navigation Company, Limited, Appellant,

661 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary
of the Treasury, et al.;

Compagnie Generale Trans-
atlantique, Appellant,
662 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary
of the Treasury, et al.;

The Netherlands-American
Steam Navigation Company
(Holland-American Line),
Appellant,
666 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary
of the Treasury, et al.;

Liverpool, Brazil and River
Plate Steam Navigation Company,
Appellant,
667 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of
the Treasury, et al.;

The Royal Mail Steam Packet
Company, Appellant,
668 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of
the Treasury, et al.;

United Steamship Company of
Copenhagen (Scandinavian-
American Line), Appellant,
669 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of
the Treasury, et al.;

The Pacific Steam Navigation
Company, Appellant,

Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury, et al.;

and

Navigazione Generale Italiana,

Appellant,

678 vs.

Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury, et al.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George W. Wickersham for the appellants.

International Mercantile Marine Company, Appellant,

693 vs.

H. C. Stuart, Acting Collector of Customs for the Port of New York, et al.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Cletus Keating for the appellant.

United American Lines (Inc.) et al., Appellants,

694 vs.

Henry C. Stuart, Acting Collector of Customs for the Port of New York, et al.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Cletus Keating for the appellants.

Raymond L. Frick et al., Appellants,

555 vs.

U. S. Webb, as Attorney General, etc., et al.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis Marshall for the appellants.

Roland C. Heisler, Plaintiff in Error,

541 vs.

Thomas Colliery Company et al.

The City of Boston, Plaintiff in Error,

141 vs.

On motion of Mr. J. W. Allen in behalf of nine States, leave was granted to file brief herein as amici curiae, and one-half hour allowed within which to make oral argument.

James Jackson, Treasurer and
Receiver General of Massachusetts,
et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted by Mr. E. H. Abbot, Mr. J. Weston Allen, and Mr. Alexander Lincoln for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Nathan Matthews and Mr. Joseph P. Lyons for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Pennsylvania Coal Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
549 vs.
H. J. Mahon et al.

On motion of Mr. George E. Alter in behalf of the State of Pennsylvania, leave was granted to file brief herein as amicus curiae, and fifteen minutes allowed within which to make oral argument.

The United States of America,
Owner of the Steamships "Clio"
and "Mooseabec", et al.,
402 vs.
Amos D. Carver et al., etc.

The motion to advance this case to be heard with case No. 109, or, in the alternative, to be advanced and heard with case No. 165, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. Curtis Rouse for Carver et al.. The suggestion that cases Nos. 109 and 402 be postponed for argument with No. 165, heretofore assigned for argument on Monday, December 4th next, was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in behalf of the United States.

Pennsylvania Coal Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
549 vs.
H. J. Mahon et al.

On motion of Mr. Philip V. Mattes in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief herein as amicus curiae.

The Pennsylvania Railroad
Company, Appellant,
585 vs.
United States Railroad Labor
Board et al.

The motion requesting that the Court treat the petition for writ of certiorari as having been filed October 18, 1922, or, in lieu thereof, that petitioner be permitted to attach the written signature of its counsel to the printed copies of the petition herein, and that thereafter the court treat said petition as having been filed October 18, 1922, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Timothy J. Scofield, Mr. Frank J. Loesch, Mr. Charles F. Loesch, and Mr. Robert W. Richards for the appellant in support of the motion, with leave to the appellees to file brief in opposition within five days.

The United States of America ex rel. the Workingmen's Cooperative Publishing Association, Plaintiff in Error. 171 vs. Albert S. Burleson, Postmaster General of the United States.	On motion of Mr. Horace S. Whitman in that behalf, the resignation of Albert S. Burleson as Postmaster General was suggested, and Hubert Work, present Postmaster General, was substituted as the party defendant in error herein.
Ex parte: In the Matter of Rose Weiss, as next friend of Antoni Karachun, Petitioner.	The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Miss Rose Weiss for the petitioner.
Concrete Steel Company, Petitioner, 238 vs. George E. Vandenburgh; and George E. Vandenburgh, Petitioner, 273 vs. Truscon Steel Company.	The motion to advance and consolidate these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Eugene C. Brown in that behalf.
Charles L. Harris, as Trustee, etc., Plaintiff in Error, 593 vs. Moreland Truck Company et al.	On motion of Mr. John C. Brooks in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error, leave was granted to file brief herein in opposition to the motion to dismiss, within two weeks.
Charles L. Harris, as Trustee, etc., Plaintiff in Error, 593 vs. Moreland Truck Company et al.	The motion to dismiss the writ of error in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. P. Morey, Mr. Bert Schlesinger, and Mr. S. C. Wright for the defendants in error in support of the motion.
The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, 316 vs. New River Collieries Company.	The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William K. Quinter in that behalf.

Eugene A. Freund et al., Appellants,
29 vs.
The United States; and
United States
35 vs.
Eugene A. Freund et al.

On motion of Mr. William R. Harr for the appellants, the mandate herein was granted.

Fox Film Corporation, Petitioner,
311 vs.
Frederick M. Knowles et al., etc.

The motion for leave to file brief herein as amicus curiae was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Joseph Lilly in that behalf.

Oliver J. Olsen et al., Petitioners,
644 vs.
Frank Campbell et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Morven Thompson in behalf of Mr. William P. Sullivan for the petitioners, and by Mr. H. W. Hutton for the respondents.

The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Appellant,
585 vs.
United States Railroad Labor Board et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. J. Scofield, Mr. Frank J. Loesch, Mr. Charles F. Loesch, and Mr. Robert W. Richards for the appellant in support of the petition.

Robert Abeles et al., Petitioners,
630 vs.
St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clifford B. Allen for the petitioners, and by Mr. Paul D. Cravath, Mr. Robert H. Neilson and Mr. Perry D. Trafford for the respondent.

The P. R. Walsh Tie and Timber Company et al., Petitioners,
632 vs.
The Missouri Pacific Railway Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clifford B. Allen for the petitioners, and by Mr. Allen C. Orrick, Mr. Paul D. Cravath, and Mr. Robert H. Neilson for the respondents.

Theodore Arenz, Bankrupt, Petitioner,
636 vs.
Astoria Savings Bank.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred A. Hampson for the petitioner.

J. H. Reeves, Trustee, etc., Petitioner,
643 vs.
The McWilliams Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. E. Mullinix for the petitioner, and by Mr. L. C. Going for the respondents.

Sue M. Jernigan, Administratrix, etc., Petitioner,
645 vs.
James C. Davis, Federal Agent.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur Crowmover and Mr. Floyd Estill for the petitioner, and by Mr. Fitzgerald Hall for the respondent.

Joseph Feigin, Petitioner,
649 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the petitioner, and by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Adams-Flanigan Company, Petitioner,
654 vs.
Charles Kling et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry E. Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. William A. Barber for the respondents.

Don J. Casey, Petitioner,
671 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Allyn Smith for the petitioner.

Honorable George R. Harvey, as Judge, etc., et al., Petitioners,
681 vs.
S. Shioji.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. Russell Alden for the petitioners.

John Hall Jones et al., Petitioners,
689 vs.
Ellen H. Phinney Taylor.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert C. Dodge and Mr. Harold S. Davis for the petitioners, and by Mr. Roland Gray for the respondent.

Salmon River Canal Company, Plaintiff in Error, 170 vs. Thomas Sanderson. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

St. Cloud Public Service Company, Appellant, 150 vs. City of St. Cloud. — It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed, per stipulation.

Clarence E. Reed et al., Petitioners, 675 vs. Hughes Tool Company. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward Rector for the petitioners, and by Mr. Melville Church for the respondent.

Central Power & Light Company, Petitioner, 461 vs. Town of Pocahontas et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered by this Court, that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alabama & Vicksburg Railway Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error, 479 vs. Louis F. Dennis. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Taggarts Paper Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
96 vs.
The State of New York.

It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to section 9 of rule 26.

Cumberland Telephone & Telegraph Company, Appellant,
650 vs.
Louisiana Public Service Commission et al., etc.

This cause was argued on the return to rule to show cause by Mr. Huey P. Long for the appellees, and by Mr. J. Blanc Monroe for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, November 14th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland. Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick W. Lehmann, it is ordered that Homer B. Carter, Esquire, of Sioux City, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Davis, it is ordered that Thomas G. Haight, Esquire, of Jersey City, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Timothy J. Scofield, it is ordered that Thomas E. Scofield, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Calvin T. Milams, it is ordered that Henry M. Huxley, Esquire, and Ross O. Hinkle, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Platt Rogers, it is ordered that Roy C. Hecox, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally,

it is ordered that T. J. Holbrook, Esquire, of Galveston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. H. Ralston, it is ordered that Leslie S. Parker, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Will R. King, it is ordered that Leslie J. Aker, Esquire, of Boise, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Borah, it is ordered that Solon B. Clark, Esquire, of Mackay, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America, Owner of the Steamships "Clio", "Mooseabee", "Fort Logan" and "Morganza", et al.,
402 vs.
Amos D. Carver and Joseph B. Morrell, copartners doing business under the firm name and style of Baker, Carver and Morrell.

On consideration of the motion to advance this case for hearing with the case of Colonial Beach Company, Owner, etc., vs. Quemahoning Coal Company et al., No. 109, of this term,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and that both cases be, and the same are hereby, assigned for hearing with the case of Blamberg Brothers vs. The United States, No. 165, October Term, 1922, already assigned for Monday, December 4th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Liberty Oil Company, Petitioner,
98 vs.
The Condon National Bank et al. and Cora C. Ball, executrix of C. M. Ball, deceased,

On motion of Mr. J. J. Jones in that behalf, the death of C. M. Ball, one of the interveners herein, was suggested, was substituted as the said intervener herein.

Bill Moore, Plaintiff in Error,
133 vs.
The State of Georgia.

This case was argued by Mr. Max Isaac for the plaintiff in error, and submitted by Mr. George M. Napier for the defendant in error.

Pennsylvania Coal Company, Plaintiff in Error,
549 vs.
H. J. Mahon et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. John W. Davis for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. W. L. Pace for the defendants in error; by Mr. George Ross Hull for the State of Pennsylvania, as amicus curiae by special leave of Court; and concluded by Mr. John W. Davis for the plaintiff in error.

Roland C. Heisler, Plaintiff in Error,
541 vs.
Thomas Colliery Company
et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Louis Marshall for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, November 15th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph R. McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices.

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

George Sutherland.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Richards, it is ordered that William F. Denny, Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. O. H. B. Bloodworth, Jr., it is ordered that Abraham S. Albrecht, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry K. Hickey, it is ordered that John J. O'Brien, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Platt Rogers, it is ordered that R. A. Van Orsdel, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. W. Clements, it is ordered that Elias Goldstein, Esquire, of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

ORDER OF ALLOTMENT OF JUSTICES.

Mr. Justice Day having resigned, it is ordered that the following allotment be made of the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of this court among the circuits, agreeably to the Act of Congress in such case made and provided, and that such allotment be entered of record, viz:

For the First Circuit, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Associate Justice.

For the Second Circuit, Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justice.

For the Third Circuit, Mahlon Pitney, Associate Justice.

For the Fourth Circuit, William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

For the Fifth Circuit, James C. McReynolds, Associate Justice.

For the Sixth Circuit, James C. McReynolds, Associate Justice.

For the Seventh Circuit, George Sutherland, Associate Justice.

For the Eighth Circuit, Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justice.

For the Ninth Circuit, Joseph McKenna, Associate Justice.

Charles A. Ramsey Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Associated Billposters of the United States and Canada et al. 100

This case was submitted by Mr. John A. Hartpence and Mr. Thomas G. Haight for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Richard T. Greene for the defendant in error.

Charles A. Ramsey Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Associated Billposters of the United States and Canada et al. 100

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Thomas G. Haight, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error as to defendants Kings County Trust Company, Annie Link, and Herwin H. Fulton, Executors of the Estate of Barney Link, deceased,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, as to defendants Kings County Trust Company, Annie Link, and Herwin H. Fulton, Executors of the Estate of Barney Link, deceased, without costs to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William H. Rankin Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
101 vs.
Associated Billposters of the
United States and Canada et al.

This case was submitted by Mr. John A. Hartpence and Mr. Thomas G. Haight for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Richard T. Greene for the defendant in error.

William H. Rankin Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
101 vs.
Associated Billposters of the
United States and Canada et al.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Thomas G. Haight, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error as to defendants Kings County Trust Company, Annie Link, and Kerwin H. Fulton, Executors of the Estate of Barney Link, deceased,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, as to defendants Kings County Trust Company, Annie Link, and Kerwin H. Fulton, Executors of the Estate of Barney Link, deceased, without costs to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Minnesota Commercial Men's
Association, Petitioner,
103 vs.
Minnie Mae Benn, as Executrix, etc.

It is ordered that this case be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

Roland C. Heisler, Plaintiff in
Error,
541 vs.
Thomas Colliery Company et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. J. Weston Allen on behalf of Nine States as amici curiae, by special leave of Court; by Mr. George E. Alter for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. Louis Marshall for the plaintiff in error.

Portsmouth Harbor Land & Hotel
Company et al., Appellants,
97 vs.
The United States.

This case was argued by Mr. Chauncey Hackett for the appellant, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee. Leave was granted appellant to file an additional brief on or before Friday next.

Liberty Oil Company,
Petitioner,
98 vs.
The Condon National Bank
et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Frederick W. Lehmann for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. John J. Jones for the respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, November 16th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices.

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

George Sutherland.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick W. Lehmann, it is ordered that Thomas C. Hennings, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, Thomas H. Gibson, of Denver, State of Colorado, Lawrence G. Southard, Esquire, of Spartanburg, State of South Carolina, and Ray M. Wiley, Esquire, of Miami, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. Jones, it is ordered that Lee Bond, Esquire, of Leavenworth, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, it is ordered that Arnold Lichtig, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. deR. Sappington, it is ordered that William H. Campbell, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William A. Oldfield, it is ordered that William T. Hammock, Esquire, and Sam T. Poe, Esquire, of Little Rock, and F. G. Lindsey, Esquire, of Bentonville, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court,

and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. E. Wright, it is ordered that Christy J. Nelson, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John D. Welman, it is ordered that Thomas Morton McDonald, Esquire, of Princeton, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Liberty Oil Company, Petitioner, 98 vs. The Condon National Bank et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. J. J. Jones for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. F. W. Lehmann for the petitioner.

Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Appellant, 99 vs. The United States.

This case was submitted by Mr. George E. Hamilton, Mr. John F. McCarron, and Mr. R. Marsden Smith for the appellant, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the appellee.

Rosenberg Bros. & Company (Inc.), Plaintiff in Error, 102 vs. Curtis Brown Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. C. H. Harris for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. J. H. Corn for the defendant in error.

Joseph W. Cox, Appellant, 71 vs. Ethel Hart.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles R. Pierce for the appellant, and by Mr. Eugene W. Britt for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, November 17th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices.

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

George Sutherland.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Mabel Walker Willebrandt, it is ordered that E. E. Noon, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Abner H. Ferguson, it is ordered that John F. Dore, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lawrence H. Cake, it is ordered that George W. Dix, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Pierce Oil Corporation,
Appellant,
597 vs.
Luther Hopkins, County Clerk, etc., et al.

The motion to continue the injunction herein in force was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sam T. Poe in that behalf.

People's National Bank of Kingfisher, Oklahoma, et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
30 vs.
Board of Equalization of Kingfisher County, Oklahoma.

This case was submitted by Mr. Horace G. McKeever and Mr. J. C. Roberts for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. George F. Short and Mr. William H. Zwick for the defendant in error.

Regal Drug Corporation,
Petitioner,
108 vs.
Justus S. Wardell, as
United States Collector,
etc.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the respondent, this case was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 36.

Greenpoint Basin & Construction Company,
Plaintiff in Error and Appellant,
31 vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. M. Hampton Todd for the appellant, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Ottinger for the appellee.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
86 vs.
Curtis Publishing Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner, and by Mr. John G. Milburn for the respondent.

Henry Hunsicker et al.,
Appellants,
104 vs.
The United States;

E. C. Palmer et al.,
Appellants,
111 vs.
The United States;

Arkansas Natural Gas
Company et al.,
Appellants,
112 vs.
The United States;

B. R. Norvell et al.,
appellants,
113 vs.
The United States;

W. H. Matthews et al., Appellants,

114 vs.

The United States:

Dillard P. Eubank et al., Appellants,

115 vs.

The United States;

Lydia Hanszen MacMullen et al.,

Appellants,

116 vs.

The United States; and

Sam W. Mason et al., Appellants,

117 vs.

The United States.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. R. L. Batts for the appellants, and continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Riter for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices.
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that Benton Baker, Esquire, of Bismarck, State of North Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward F. Treadwell, it is ordered that Fred G. Athearn, Esquire, of Berkeley, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sydney R. Prince, it is ordered that Harry Skinner, Esquire, of Greenville, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John D. Welman, it is ordered that Louis Seelbach, Jr., Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. Coulter Wells, it is ordered that Arthur Hannum Deibert, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William F.

Hall, it is ordered that Arthur H. Boettcher, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William P. Rynum, it is ordered that Thomas D. Warren, Esquire, of Newbern, and Sidney S. Alderman, Esquire, of Greensboro, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt, it is ordered that Alfred Hurrell, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. Riter, it is ordered that Harvey H. Cluff, Esquire, and Harold P. Fabian, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Challen B.Ellis, it is ordered that Samuel A. Berger, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, it is ordered that Donald W. Johnson, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sidney L. Herold, it is ordered that A. V. Coco, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas Sterling, it is ordered that W. A. Morris, Esquire, of Redfield, South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

John P. Kline, Milton Winham, and Paul G. Huckins, as the Board of Improvement of Paving Improvement District No. 20, of the City of Texarkana, Arkansas,

Petitioners,

81 vs.

Burke Construction Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Arkansas in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The United States of America, Appellant,

45 vs.

Minnie Atkins et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Nancy Atkins et al., Appellants,

46 vs.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Cumberland Telephone & Telegraph
Company, Appellant,
650 vs.
Louisiana Public Service Commission
et al., etc.

ORDER.

First. The motion of appellees is granted and the order of injunction granted by Judge Foster when allowing the appeal is set aside as without jurisdiction.

Second. The application to this Court for an injunction maintaining the status quo is referred to the District Court constituted of three judges for its determination. The costs on this motion will be taxed to the appellant.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

It is ordered by the Court that the accompanying correspondence between members of the Court and Mr. Justice Clarke upon his retirement as an Associate Justice of the Court be this day spread upon the record and that it also be printed in the Reports of the Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Washington, D. C.,

October 24, 1922.

Dear Brother Clarke:

Your resignation as a member of this Court during the vacation has delayed a joint expression of our sincere regret at parting with you as a

colleague.

Service as a Federal Judge in the lower courts had fitted you quickly to put your shoulder to the wheel here. The number and excellence of your opinions, contained in the twelve volumes from 242 to 258, inclusive, of our reports, testify to the debt the country owes you for the share you have had in carrying the great burden that rested upon this Court during the period of the great War, and the years immediately preceding and following it.

We shall miss much your earnest and constant application, your kindly and loyal spirit of companionship, and your generous courtesy. We wish to assure you of our affectionate regard and respect for you as a man and a public servant.

You still have, we hope, many years of usefulness before you. Our best wishes go with you.

Sincerely yours,

(signed) William H. Taft,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
Louis D. Brandeis.

Hon. John H. Clarke,
Youngstown, Ohio.

John H. Clarke,
Youngstown, Ohio.

November 13, 1922.

My dear Chief Justice:

The joint expression of friendship and regard of my former brethren of the Court which you send me is very grateful, and I am sure you all know that I fully and sincerely reciprocate the feeling. The recollection of the unvarying kindness of you all to me - the one thing I miss and the loss of which I feel - will always be one of the most precious possessions of my life.

It seemed best for me to resign my office while I still had strength sufficient to take up other duties, but I shall watch the work of you all

with interest and sympathy, confident from my intimate associations with you that the great tradition of the Court for learning, independence and impartial decision will be abundantly maintained.

Even here, I cannot withhold the expression of the hope that the bill pending in Congress to modify the imperative statutory jurisdiction of the Court may soon become a law so that you may not be so burdened with unimportant cases as you now are, and so may have more time and strength for the consideration of the many causes of great public concern constantly coming before you, the decision of which is so fateful to our country.

Wishing for each one of you the health and strength so necessary to the discharge of your high duties, I am,

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) John H. Clarke.

Hon. William H. Taft,
Chief Justice of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

The New York Central Railroad
Company, Petitioner,
433 vs.
Middleport Gas & Electric Light
Company.

ORDER.

The petition for certiorari in this case was denied on the ground that it was not filed in time. Petitioner now moves for a rehearing on the ground that its petition arrived in the Clerk's Office on the afternoon of the day before it was filed, in seasonable time. Without considering or deciding this question, the Court has examined the petition on its merits and denies it.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The New York Central Railroad
Company, Petitioner,
433 vs.
Middleport Gas & Electric Light
Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon

had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Land Bank of New Orleans, Plaintiff in Error,
428 vs.
D. W. Crossland, Judge of Probate.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 5th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Cunard Steam Ship Company, Limited, et al., Appellants,
659 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury, et al.

The Oceanic Steam Navigation Company, Limited, Appellant,
660 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury, et al.

International Navigation Company, Limited, Appellant,
661 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury, et al.

Compagnie Generale Transatlantique, Appellant,
662 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury, et al.

The Netherlands-American Steam Navigation Company (Holland-American Line), Appellant,
666 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of

Liverpool, Brazil and River Plate
Steam Navigation Company, Appellant,
667 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the
Treasury, et al.

The Royal Mail Steam Packet Company,
Appellant,
668 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the
Treasury, et al.

United Steamship Company of Copenhagen
(Scandinavian-American Line), Appellant,
669 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the
Treasury, et al.

The Pacific Steam Navigation Company,
Appellant,
670 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the
Treasury, et al.

Navigazione Generale Italiana,
Appellant,
678 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the
Treasury, et al.

On consideration of the motions to advance these cases,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Tuesday, January 2d next, to be heard as one case.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

International Mercantile Marine
Company, Appellant,
693 vs.
H. C. Stuart, Acting Collector
of Customs for the Port of New
York, et al.

and

United American Lines (Inc.)
et al., Appellants,
694 vs.
Henry C. Stuart, Acting
Collector of Customs for the
Port of New York, et al.

On consideration of the motions to advance these cases,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Tuesday, January 2d next, to be heard as one case.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Raymond L. Frick et al., Appellants,
555 vs.
U. S. Webb, as Attorney General, etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance and set this cause for hearing with cases Nos. 267, 299 and 302, heretofore assigned for Monday, November 27th,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; but the cases are postponed for hearing before a full Bench.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Concrete Steel Company, Petitioner,
238 vs.
George E. Vandenburgh.
and
George E. Vandenburgh, Petitioner,
273 vs.
Truscon Steel Company.

On consideration of the motion to consolidate these cases,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and that case No. 273 be heard with No. 238 when the latter case is reached in regular order.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,
316 vs.
New River Collieries Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 5th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, without prejudice to the right of the petitioner to apply for a writ of habeas corpus to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington directed to the officers in charge of the McNeil Island Penitentiary.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fox Film Corporation, Petitioner,
311 vs.
Frederick Knowles et al., etc.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file brief of J. Joseph Lilly herein on behalf of the Sunrise Pictures Corporation, as amicus curiae,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pierce Oil Corporation, Appellant,
697 vs.
Luther Hopkins, County Clerk, etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion to continue in force the temporary injunction herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, the appellees not objecting; and that the bond herein be, and the same is hereby, approved.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Appellant,
585 vs.
United States Railroad Labor Board et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Margaret C. Lynch, Executrix of E. J. Lynch, Collector, etc., Petitioner,
655 vs.
Tilden Produce Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the

argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Theodore Arenz, Bankrupt, Petitioner,
636 vs.
Astoria Savings Bank.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. H. Reeves, Trustee, etc., Petitioner,
643 vs.
The McWilliams Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oliver J. Olson et al., Petitioners,
644 vs.
Frank Campbell et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sue M. Jernigan, Administratrix of Ike Jernigan, deceased, Petitioner,
645 vs.
James C. Davis, Federal

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph Feigin, Petitioner,
649 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Adams-Flanigan Company, Petitioner,
654 vs.
Charles Kling et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Municipal Court, City of New York, Borough of Bronx, Second District, of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the said Municipal Court, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Don J. Casey, Petitioner,
671 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Clarence E. Reed et al.,
Petitioners,
675 vs.
Hughes Tool Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the

United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hon. George R. Harvey, as Judge, etc., et al., Petitioners,
681 vs.
S. Shioji.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Hall Jones et al., Petitioners,
689 vs.
Ellen H. Phinney-Taylor.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Probate Court for Plymouth County, State of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Probate Court for Plymouth County, State of Massachusetts, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Union Stock Yards Company of Omaha (Limited), Plaintiff in Error,
409 vs.
Mayhall & Noible, a copartnership, et al., etc.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied, because of failure to file the petition within the time prescribed by the statute.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Onepiece Bifocal Lens Company, Petitioner,
590 vs.
Harold J. Stead, doing business as H. J. Stead

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied, because of failure to file the petition within the time prescribed by the statute.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Bill Moore, Plaintiff in Error,
133 vs.
The State of Georgia.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

People's National Bank of Kingfisher, Oklahoma, et al., Plaintiffs in Error.
30 vs.
Board of Equalization of Kingfisher County, Oklahoma.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Michael Heitler, Plaintiff in Error,
185 vs.
The United States;

Nathaniel Perlman, Plaintiff in Error,
186 vs.
The United States of America;

Mandel Greenberg,
Plaintiff in Error,
187 vs.
The United States of
America;

Frank McCann,
Plaintiff in Error,
188 vs.
The United States of
America; and

George F. Quinn,
Plaintiff in Error,
189 vs.
The United States of
America.

The motion to dismiss the writs of error in these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Weymouth Kirkland for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

The United States of America ex rel. the Workingmen's Cooperative Publishing Association,
Plaintiff in Error,
171 vs.
Hubert Work, Postmaster General of the United States.

The motion to dismiss the writ of error in this case on the ground that the case is moot was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the defendant in error in support of the motion.

Armour & Company,
Petitioner,
695 vs.
Louisville Provision Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Conrad H. Syme in behalf of Mr. George P. Fisher and Mr. Helm Bruce for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward P. Humphrey, Mr. Alexander P. Humphrey, and Mr. William W. Crawford in opposition thereto.

Benjamin Gitlow, Plaintiff in Error
--- vs.
The People of the State of New York.

The petition for a writ of error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph R. Brodsky for the plaintiff in error.

Paul V. Lacoste et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
453 vs.
Department of Conservation of the State of Louisiana.

The motion to dismiss the writ of error herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Paul A. Sompayrac for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Edwin T. Merrick and Mr. Ralph J. Schwarz for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Henry Hunsicker et al., Appellants,
104 vs.
The United States of America;
E. G. Palmer et al., Appellants,
111 vs.
The United States of America;
Arkansas Natural Gas Company et al., Appellants,
112 vs.
The United States of America;

B. R. Morvell et al., Appellants,
113 vs.
The United States of America;
W. H. Matthews et al., Appellants,
114 vs.
The United States of America;
Dillard P. Eubank et al., Appellants,
115 vs.
The United States of America;
Lydia Hanszen MacMullen et al., Appellants,
116 vs.
The United States of America; and

Sam W. Mason et al.,
Appellants,
117 vs.
The United States of
America.

On motion of Mr. S. L. Herold for the appellants in these cases, leave was granted to file a supplemental brief herein.

Department of Trade and Commerce of the State of Nebraska et al., etc., Petitioners,
467 vs.
A. J. Hertz et al., Receivers, etc.

The motion to advance this case was submitted by Mr. Bruce W. Sanborn and Mr. William G. Graves for the respondents.

Lion Bonding and Surety Company, Petitioner,
574 vs.
A. H. Karatz.

The motion to advance this case was submitted by Mr. Bruce W. Sanborn and Mr. William G. Graves for the respondent.

Fred Wolf et al., Petitioners,
658 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Don M. Johnson in behalf of Mr. James M. Johnson for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim, and Mr. Franklin C. Wixson for the respondent, with leave to counsel for the petitioner to file a reply brief within three days.

The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Appellant,
585 vs.
United States Railroad Labor Board et al.

The motion to advance this case was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellees.

The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Appellant,
585 vs.
United States Railroad Labor Board et al.

On motion of Mr. John S. Flannery for the appellant, leave was granted to file opposition to the motion to advance this case.

Benjamin Citlow, Plaintiff in Error,
--- vs.
The People of the State of New York.

On motion of Mr. Samuel A. Berger for the defendant in error, leave was granted to file opposition to petition for a writ of error.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, etc., Petitioner,
692 vs.
Samuel Wechsler.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. O. H. Dean, Mr. H. M. Langworthy, and Mr. Roy B. Thomson for the petitioner.

Henry Hunsicker et al., Appellants,
104 vs.
The United States of America;
E. C. Palmer et al., Appellants,
111 vs.
The United States;
Arkansas Natural Gas Company et al., Appellants,
112 vs.
The United States of America;
B. R. Norvell et al., Appellants,
113 vs.
The United States of America;
W. H. Matthews et al., Appellants,
114 vs.
The United States of America;
Dillard P. Eubank et al., Appellants,
115 vs.
The United States of America;
Lydia Hanszen MacMullen et al., Appellants,
116 vs.
The United States of America; and
Sam W. Mason et al., Appellants,
117 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Riter for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. S. L. Herold for the appellants.

Thomas J. Stockley et al.,
Appellants,
74 vs.
The United States of
America.

This case was argued by Mr. S. L. Herold for the appellants, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Riter for the appellee.

Sioux City Bridge Company,
Petitioner,
105 vs.
Dakota County, Nebraska.

This case was argued by Mr. F. W. Sargent for the petitioner, and by Mr. R. A. Van Orsdel for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, November 21st, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices.
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jean Paul Muller, it is ordered that William A. Garlick, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis S. Maguire, it is ordered that Ford W. Harris, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wells Goody-koontz, it is ordered that Russell S. Ritz, Esquire, of Bluefield, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Charles McKelvey et al., Petitioners,
106 vs.
The United States.

This case was argued by Mr. Solon B. Clark for the petitioners, and by Mr. H. L. Underwood for the respondent.

Southern Railway Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
107 vs.
Joseph H. Clift.

This case was argued by Mr. John D. Welman for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Thomas M. McDonald for the defendant in error.

New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Company, Petitioner,
110 vs.
John W. Kinney.

This case was argued by Mr. M. C. Spratt for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hamilton Ward for the respondent.

Jeems Bayou Fishing and
Hunting Club et al.,
Appellants,
119 vs.
The United States; and
The United States,
Appellant,
137 vs.
Jeems Bayou Fishing and
Hunting Club et al.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. H. T. Klein for Jeems Bayou Fishing and Hunting Club et al.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, November 22nd, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices.
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

John S. Kendall, Administrator, etc., et al., Appellants,
157 of 1921. vs.
Paul A. Ewert.

The motion to withdraw original papers in this case was submitted by Mr. Will R. King in that behalf.

Frank Gonsalves, Appellant,
125 vs.
Morse Dry Dock & Repair Company.

On motion of Mr. C. J. McDermott in that behalf, it is ordered that this case be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

Jeems Bayou Fishing and Hunting Club et al., Appellants,
119 vs.
The United States; and
The United States, Appellant,
137 vs.
Jeems Bayou Hunting and Fishing Club et al.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. H. T. Klein for Jeems Bayou Hunting and Fishing Club et al., by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Riter for The United States, and concluded by Mr. Hampden Story for Jeems Bayou Hunting and Fishing Club et al.

Southern Railway Company, Appellant,
368 vs.
A. D. Watts et al.;
Atlantic & Yadkin Railway Company,
Appellant,
369 vs.
A. D. Watts et al.;

Seaboard Air Line Railway
Company, Appellant,
381 vs.
A. D. Watts et al.;
Atlantic Coast Line Railroad
Company, Appellant,
382 vs.
A. D. Watts et al.; and
Norfolk Southern Railroad
Company, Appellant,
383 vs.
A. D. Watts et al.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. S. H. Prince for the appellants in Nos. 368 and 369, and by Mr. William P. Bynum for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, November 23rd, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices.

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

George Sutherland.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wesley L. Jones, it is ordered that Raymond W. Clifford, Esquire, of Tacoma, and E. V. Kuykendall, Esquire, of Olympia, State of Washington, and Hugh Taylor Gordon, Jr., Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles R. Hollingsworth, it is ordered that James H. DeVine, Esquire, of Ogden, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. B. Cummins, it is ordered that Bruce J. Flick, Esquire, of Des Moines, and Frank E. Farwell, Esquire, of Waterloo, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James C. McLaughlin, it is ordered that Charles G. Turner, Esquire, and Laurence W. Smith, Esquire, of Grand Rapids, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ross A. Collins, it is ordered that E. L. Dent, Esquire, of Collins, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, it is ordered that Mart H. Royston, Esquire, of Galveston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur P. Carpenter, it is ordered that Melville P. Maurice, Esquire, of Brattleboro, State of Vermont, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. Wayne Parker, it is ordered that Clark Burdick, Esquire, of Newport, State of Rhode Island, and Thomas Jefferson Ryan, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Osaka Shosen Kaisha et al.,
Petitioners,
129 vs.
Pacific Export Lumber
Company.

This case was submitted by Mr. William H. Hayden for the petitioners and by Mr. Erskine Wood for the respondent.

Thomas B. Stocker,
Plaintiff in Error,
130 vs.
Nemaha Drainage District
No. 2.

On motion of Mr. C. E. Roach for the plaintiff in error, the death of Thomas B. Stocker was suggested and Harriet Stocker and T. P. B. Stocker were substituted as the parties plaintiffs in error herein.

On motion of Mr. C. E. Roach for the plaintiffs in error, it is ordered that this case be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

Southern Railway Company,
Appellant,
368 vs.
A. D. Watts et al.;
Atlantic & Yadkin Railway
Company, Appellant,
369 vs.
A. D. Watts et al.;

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company,
Appellant,
381 vs.
A. D. Watts et al.;
Atlantic Coast Line Railroad
Company, Appellant,
382 vs.
A. D. Watts et al.; and
Norfolk Southern Railroad Company,
Appellant,
383 vs.
A. D. Watts et al.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Murray Allen for the appellant in No. 381, by Mr. Sidney S. Alderman for the appellees, by Mr. Thomas W. Davis for the appellant in No. 382, by Mr. James S. Manning for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. W. B. Rodman for the appellants in No. 383.

On motion of Mr. S. R. Prince in that behalf, leave was granted to appellants to file additional brief within three days.

The United States, Plaintiff in Error,
39 vs.
Vito Lanza et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. John F. Dore for the defendants in error.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf, leave was granted plaintiff in error to file additional brief by Tuesday next.

St. Louis Cotton Compress Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
120 vs.
The State of Arkansas.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. George B. Rose for the plaintiff in error and continued by Mr. William T. Hammock for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices.

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

George Sutherland.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul Bakewell, it is ordered that Victor C. Cormier, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ben A. Matthews, it is ordered that Samuel J. Rawak, Esquire, and Thomas J. Crawford, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wesley L. Jones, it is ordered that Guy B. Groff, Esquire, and Fred A. Adams, Esquire, of Spokane, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward L. Craig, it is ordered that J. Nelson Frierson, Esquire, of Columbia, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. J. Adams, it is ordered that Charles A. Hardy, Esquire, of Eugene, and J. M. Devers, Esquire, of Salem, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

American Railway Express

Company, Plaintiff in Error,

131 vs.
Hanna R. Kristianson, etc.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

St. Louis Cotton Compress Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
120 vs.
The State of Arkansas.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. William T. Hammock for the defendant in error and concluded by Mr. F. G. Lindsey for the defendant in error.

American Mills Company,
Petitioner,
118 vs.
American Surety Company of New York.

This case was argued by Mr. Henry Uttal for the petitioner, and by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt for the respondent.

The United States, Appellant,
121 vs.
Mason & Hanger Company; and
The United States, Appellant,
122 vs.
North-Eastern Construction Company.

This case was argued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the appellant and by Mr. George A. King for the appellees.

Southern Express Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
123 vs.
Terry Packing Company.

This case was argued by Mr. J. Nelson Frierson for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. E. L. Craig for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, November 27th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices.

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

George Sutherland.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Mabel Walker Willebrandt, it is ordered that Howard T. Jones, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Miles Poindexter, it is ordered that Fabian B. Dodds, Esquire, of Spokane, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George H. Smith, it is ordered that Stephen L. Richards, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Walsh, it is ordered that Beeman Strong, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Bruce J. Flick, it is ordered that W. R. C. Hendrick, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul Bakewell,

it is ordered that M. Joseph Donovan, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry H. Snelling, it is ordered that Charles C. Bulkley, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America, vs. Oregon Lumber Company et al. — On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

40

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the first question certified must be answered in the affirmative; and, as this disposes of the case, no answer to Question No. 2 is required.

Whereupon, it is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Brandeis,
Mr. Chief Justice Taft,
Mr. Justice Holmes.

General Investment Company, Appellant, vs. The Lake Shore & Michigan Southern Railway Company et al. — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

34

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, modified by making the dismissal without prejudice as to all parts of the bill, and, as so modified, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Roland C. Heisler,
Plaintiff in Error,
541 vs.
Thomas Colliery Company
et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Liberty Oil Company,
Petitioner,
98 vs.
The Condon National Bank
et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

The United States,
Petitioner,
578 vs.
Lippman, Spier & Hahn.

On consideration of the application for reconsideration of the order denying petition for a writ of certiorari herein, it is now here ordered that the said application be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Department of Trade and
Commerce of the State of

Nebraska et al., etc., Petitioners,
467 vs.
A. J. Hertz et al., etc., Receivers, etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 26th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lion Bonding & Surety Company, Petitioner,
574 vs.
A. H. Karatz.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 26th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Appellant,
585 vs.
United States Railroad Labor Board et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 8th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles L. Harris, as Trustee of the Davis Transit Company, etc., Plaintiff in Error,
593 vs.
Moreland Truck Company et al.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Michael Heitler, Plaintiff in Error,
185 vs.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern Dis-

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Nathaniel Perlman, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America. 186 — In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mandel Greenberg, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America. 187 — In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank McCann, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America. 188 — In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois,

and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George F. Quinn, Plaintiff in Error,
189 vs.
The United States of America.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Benjamin Gitlow, Plaintiff in Error,
--- Orig'l. vs.
The People of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of error in this cause, submitted to the whole Court,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Paul V. Lacoste et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
453 vs.
Department of Conservation of the State of Louisiana.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John S. Kendall, Administrator, etc., et al., Appellants,
157 of 1921. vs.
Paul A. Ewert.

On consideration of the motion as to (1) withdrawal of original paper of notice of dismissal of counsel, dated December 31, 1921,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

It is further ordered by this Court that the motion as to (2) original deed of July 5, 1918, from George Redeagle to Paul A. Ewert and as to (3) original deeds of November 19, November 21, and December 21, 1921, from the heirs of George Redeagle to Paul A. Ewert, be, and the same is hereby, granted, copies of said deeds on file to remain with the Clerk.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, etc., Petitioner,
692 vs.
Samuel Wechsler.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Kansas City Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Kansas City Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert Abeles et al., Petitioners,
630 vs.
St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The P. R. Walsh Tie and Timber Company et al., Petitioners,
632 vs.
The Missouri Pacific Railway Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of

the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fred Wolf et al., Petitioners,
638 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Armour & Company, Petitioner,
695 vs.
Louisville Provision Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr.Chief Justice Taft.

The City of Trenton, Plaintiff in Error,
430 vs.
The State of New Jersey.

It is ordered by this Court that this cause be reassigned for argument on Monday, February 26th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The City of Newark, Plaintiff in Error,
469 vs.
The State of New Jersey.

It is ordered by this Court that this case be reassigned for argument on Monday, February 26th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Russell Motor Car Company, Appellant,
485 vs.
The United States.

It is ordered by this Court that this cause be reassigned for argument on Monday, February 26th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Complainant, 20, Orig'l. vs. The State of New York et al.

The motion for appointment of a Special Master to take proofs and make advisory report to the court was submitted by Mr. Charles L. Pierce for the City of Rochester, a defendant; with consent thereto by Mr. J. Weston Allen for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Complainant, 20, Orig'l. vs. The State of New York et al.

The motion that the War Department make certified copies of certain maps and documents for use on trial of the case was submitted by Mr. Charles L. Pierce for the City of Rochester, a defendant; with consent thereto by Mr. J. Weston Allen for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Board of Trade of the City of Chicago et al., Appellants, 701 vs. Charles P. Clyne, United States District Attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, et al.

The motion to advance and to continue stay pending appeal was submitted by Mr. H. S. Robbins for the appellants.

Elbert R. Robinson, Plaintiff in Error, 289 vs. The People of the State of Illinois.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward N. Mittle, Plaintiff in Error, 674 vs. The State of South Carolina.

The motion to dismiss the writ of error in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel M. Wolfe for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Charles A. Douglas and Mr. Hugh H. Obear for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Mr. Cole L. Blease.

The United States of America ex rel. the Western Union Telegraph Company, Plaintiff in Error,
378 vs.
Interstate Commerce Commission.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward N. Mittle, Plaintiff in Error,
674 vs.
The State of South Carolina.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Douglas, Mr. Hugh H. Obear, and Mr. Cole L. Blease for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition, and by Mr. Samuel M. Wolfe in opposition thereto.

Wagner Electric Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
682 vs.
Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Melville Church and Mr. Edwin E. Huffman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Paul Bakewell and Mr. John C. Kerr for the respondent.

The Valley Farms Company of Yonkers, Plaintiff in Error,
136 vs.
The County of Westchester.

It is ordered that this case be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

George B. Kirby et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
126 vs.
The United States of America on behalf of the Crow Tribe of Indians.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Milton S. Gunn for the plaintiffs in error, continued by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Seymour for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Edgar Allen Poe for the plaintiffs in error.

Champlain Realty Company,
Petitioner,
128 vs.
Town of Brattleboro.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. W. C. Carmon for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Arthur P. Carpenter for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, November 28th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices.

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

George Sutherland.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur Peter, it is ordered that Michel Kirtland, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. Wallace Dempsey, it is ordered that Lester D. Volk, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John G. Buchanan, it is ordered that Karl F. Overholt, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

James L. Brooks

197 vs.

The United States;

The United States of America,

Plaintiff in Error,

403 vs.

George Remus et al., etc.; and

The United States, Plaintiff in Error,

26 vs.

Chris Elioff Stafoff, alias Chris Elioff,

The motion for leave to file a brief herein as amicus curiae was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt in behalf of Anti-Saloon League of America; and the motion was denied.

Regal Drug Corporation, Petitioner, vs. Justus S. Wardell, as United States Collector, etc. 108	This case was submitted by Mr. John W. Preston for the petitioner, and by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. Solicitor General Beck, and Mr. Robert P. Reeder for the respondent.
Champlain Realty Company, Petitioner, vs. Town of Brattleboro. 128	The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Ernest W. Gibson for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. M. P. Maurice for the petitioner.
James C. Davis, Director General, etc., Petitioner, vs. Mrs. Maude E. Green, Administratrix, etc. 132	This case was argued by Mr. T. J. Wills for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. W. Cassedy for the respondent.
August Bartels, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Iowa. 134	This case was argued by Mr. Frank E. Farwell for the plaintiff in error, and the case submitted by Mr. Bruce J. Flick for the defendant in error.
Ernest G. Walker, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Genevieve K. Gish. 135	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. S. Herbert Giesy for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, November 29th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices.

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

George Sutherland.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. B. Webster, it is ordered that William R. Seaton, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Miles Poindexter, it is ordered that Ralph Robinson, Esquire, of Spokane, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Ernest G. Walker, Plaintiff in Error,
135 vs.
Genevieve K. Gish.

The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. S. Herbert Giesy for the plaintiff in error. There was no appearance for the defendant in error.

Georgia Railway & Power Company et al., Appellants,
298 vs.
Railroad Commission of Georgia et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. L. Z. Rosser for the appellants, continued by Mr. E. J. Reagan for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Robert G. Dodge for the appellants.

James L. Brooks
197 vs.
The United States:
The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,

403 vs.

George Remus et al., etc.;

and

The United States of

America, Plaintiff in Error.

26 vs.

Chris Elioff Stafoff, etc.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the United States, continued by Mr. Samuel Herrick for James L. Brooks, by Mr. E. N. Zoline for the defendant in error in No. 403, and concluded by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the United States.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, December 4th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices.
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. A. Severance, it is ordered that George W. Morgan, Esquire, of St. Paul, and Elmer F. Blu, Esquire, and Oscar Mitchell, Esquire, of Duluth, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick W. Lehmann, it is ordered that Edward Clymer Hyde, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, and Erwin W. Clausen, Esquire, of Atchison, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Mabel W. Willebrandt, it is ordered that Henry W. Drucker, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. A. Oldfield, it is ordered that A. M. Nicks, Esquire, of Biggers, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., it is ordered that E. C. Higbee, Esquire, of Uniontown, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Charles McKelvey et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 106

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Idaho.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The Portsmouth Harbor Land and Hotel Company et al., Appellants, vs. The United States. 97

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Brandeis.
Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The New York Central and Hudson River Railroad Company, vs. John W. Kinney. 110

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

St. Louis Cotton Compress Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Arkansas. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

120

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, and Agent under Section 206 of Transportation Act of 1920, Petitioner, vs. Mrs. Maude E. Green, Administratrix of the Estate of Jesse Green, deceased. — On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

132

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Southern Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Joseph H. Clift. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana.

107

Supreme Court of the State of Indiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The United States, Appellant,
121 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.
Mason & Hanger Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The United States, Appellant,
122 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.
Northeastern Construction
Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The City of Boston, Plaintiff
in Error,
141 vs. In Error to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts.
James Jackson, Treasurer and
Receiver General of the Common-
wealth of Massachusetts, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts, upon the motion to dismiss or affirm, and was argued upon briefs by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Judicial Court, in this cause, be,

and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced that the Court will take a recess from Monday, the 11th instant, until Tuesday, January 2, next.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Complainant, vs. The State of New York et al. 20, Original. On consideration of the motion for the appointment of a Special Master to take proofs and make report herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Complainant, vs. The State of New York, et al. 20, Original. On consideration of the motion of certain defendants herein, asking for a certificate to the effect that certified copies of certain maps are essential to the ends of justice in the above styled cause;

It is ordered by this Court that copies of:

(1). Map of the mouth of the Genesee River, New York, dated January 22, 1829, by W.T. Maurice, Captain Corps Engineers. (D-64 Flat).

(2). Map showing condition of the Genesee River harbor, New York, June 30, 1874, survey made under direction of Major John M. Wilson, Corps of Engineers, by William P. Judson, April 7th to 8th, 1874. (D-268 Roll).

(3). Map of Charlotte harbor, New York, 1888, made by direction of Captain Carl F. Palfrey, Corps of Engineers, by William P. Judson, Assistant Engineer. (D-520 Flat).

(4). Map of Charlotte harbor prepared under the direction of Captain W. L. Guthrie, and filed November 22, 1909. This map is on file in the Buffalo office of the Chief Engineer of the War Department at Buffalo, New York, labeled CS. 21-4.

are essential to the ends of justice in the above styled cause proper to be used as proofs therein.

It is further ordered that the Clerk of this Court do certify a copy of this order to the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, for the purpose of procuring from him, on behalf of these defendants, copies of said

maps duly certified to by said Chief of Engineers of the United States Army.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Board of Trade of the City of Chicago et al., Appellants, vs. Charles F. Clyne, United States District Attorney for the Northern District of Illinois.

701

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 15th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Board of Trade of the City of Chicago, et al., Appellants, vs. Charles F. Clyne, United States District Attorney, et al.

701

It is ordered by this Court, the defendants not objecting, that the status quo be preserved while this cause is pending in this Court and for twenty days thereafter by restraining and enjoining the appellee, Charles F. Clyne, as United States District Attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, from attempting to enforce the Act of Congress entitled the "Grain Futures Act" during the pendency of this cause in this Court and for twenty days thereafter, and also from at any time prosecuting criminally, or otherwise, under said act any member of the Board of Trade of the City of Chicago, or any customer of any such member, for, or by reason of, any violation by him or them of any provision of said act committed during the pendency of this cause in this Court or twenty days thereafter, and that appellee, Arthur C. Lueder, as postmaster of the city of Chicago, be also restrained and enjoined from interfering with any of the mail passing between members of said Board of Trade and customers of said members during the pendency of this cause in this Court and twenty days thereafter.

Provided, however, that nothing herein shall relieve the members of said Board of Trade from severally keeping and preserving, as required by the Grain Futures Act, their records of their contracts for future delivery during the pendency of this stay.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward H. Mittle, Plaintiff in Error,

The State of South Carolina.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward M. Mittle, Plaintiff in Error,
674 vs.
The State of South Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. W. Lee, Plaintiff in Error,
422 vs.
Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company.

The motion to advance this case under Rule 6 was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Allan D. Cole for the plaintiff in error.

Fred P. Violette, Appellant,
676 vs.
James A. Walsh, Collector, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph W. Cox for the petitioner, and by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

The United States of America,
Owner, etc.,
402 vs.
Amos D. Carver et al., etc.

On motion of Mr. George C. Sprague in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief herein as amicus curiae; and the motion for leave to take part in the oral argument was denied.

Henry Freygang et al., Appellants,
480 vs.
The United States.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George A. King for the appellants.

Eddie Harrison et al., Petitioners, vs. Dick Harrison. 691

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Otto A. Schlobohm in behalf of Mr. Wesley E. Disney and Mr. John M. Wheeler for the petitioners; with leave to file printed copies of the record and petition hereafter.

Tom Reed Gold Mines Company, Petitioner, vs. United Eastern Mining Company. 708

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William E. Colby for the petitioner, and by Mr. John P. Gray for the respondent.

Union Trust & Savings Bank, as Trustee, etc., et al., Petitioners, vs. The Southern Traction Company of Illinois et al. 709

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hiram T. Gilbert, Mr. John C. Slade, and Mr. Walter Bachrach for the petitioners, and by Mr. William Boye, Mr. Edward C. Kramer, Mr. Bruce A. Campbell, and Mr. George B. Logan for the respondents.

American Railway Express Company, Petitioner, vs. A. J. Lindenberg. 138

This case was argued by Mr. A. M. Hartung for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. B. Dyer and Mr. Morgan Owen for the respondent.

The United States ex rel. Aaron Suhonen, Appellant, vs. Frederick A. Wallis, Commissioner of Immigration, etc. 139

This case was submitted by Mr. Charles Recht for the appellant, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the appellee.

Kansas City Southern Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Elizabeth Van Zant. 142

This case was argued by Mr. Samuel W. Moore for the petitioner, and submitted by Mr. Charles H. Montgomery for the respondent.

Pullman Company, Plaintiff in Error,

Friend W. Richardson, as Treasurer,
etc.;
Pullman Company, Plaintiff in
Error,
144 vs.
Friend W. Richardson, as Treasurer,
etc.;
Pullman Company, Plaintiff in
Error,
145 vs.
Friend W. Richardson, as Treasurer,
etc.;
Pullman Company, Plaintiff in
Error,
146 vs.
Friend W. Richardson, as Treasurer,
etc.;
Pullman Company, Plaintiff in
Error,
147 vs.
Friend W. Richardson, as Treasurer,
etc.;
Pullman Company, Plaintiff in
Error,
148 vs.
Friend W. Richardson, as Treasurer,
etc.;
Walker D. Hines, as Director General,
etc., et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
149 vs.
Friend W. Richardson, as Treasurer, etc.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. C. A. Severance for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, December 5th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices.
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. White, Jr., it is ordered that James B. McLoughlin, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick W. Lehmann, it is ordered that Harry B. Hawes, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merrill Moores, it is ordered that Lloyd D. Claycombe, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Texas,
Plaintiff in Error,
679 vs.
Eastern Texas Railroad
Company et al.; and
The State of Texas,
Appellant,
680 vs.
Eastern Texas Railroad
Company et al.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted by Mr. Blackburn Esterline in behalf of counsel for the appellees.

Panama Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
155 vs.
James Hock.

It is ordered that this case be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

Walker D. Hines, as Director General, etc., et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
149 vs.
Friend W. Richardson, as Treasurer, etc.

The motion to substitute James C. Davis, present Director General of Railroads, as party plaintiff in error herein, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. A. McLaughlin in that behalf.

Pullman Company, Plaintiff in Error,
143 vs.
Friend W. Richardson, as Treasurer, etc.;
Pullman Company, Plaintiff in Error,
144 vs.
Friend W. Richardson, as Treasurer, etc.;
Pullman Company, Plaintiff in Error,
145 vs.
Friend W. Richardson, as Treasurer, etc.;
Pullman Company, Plaintiff in Error,
146 vs.
Friend W. Richardson, as Treasurer, etc.;
Pullman Company, Plaintiff in Error,
147 vs.
Friend W. Richardson, as Treasurer, etc.;
Pullman Company, Plaintiff in Error,

148 vs.
Friend W. Richardson, as
Treasurer, etc.;
Walker D. Hines, as Director
General, etc., et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
149 vs.
Friend W. Richardson, as
Treasurer, etc.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. C. A. Severance for the plaintiffs in error, and the cases submitted by Mr. U. S. Webb and Mr. Raymond Benjamin for the defendants in error.

The United States,
Appellant,
151 vs.
Arthur John Bancroft.

This case was argued by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Seymour for the appellant, and by Mr. George A. King for the appellee.

Great Northern Railway
Company, Petitioner,
152 vs.
Vivian H. Steinke et al.

This case was argued by Mr. C. J. Murphy for the petitioner. No brief was filed for the respondents.

John Barton Payne, Director
General, etc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
153 vs.
A. E. Stevens et al.

This case was submitted by Mr. Gregory L. Smith for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. J. B. Harris for the defendants in error.

Blamberg Brothers,
Appellant,
165 vs.
The United States;
Colonial Beach Company,
Owner, etc., Petitioner,
109 vs.
Quemahoning Coal Company
et al.: and
The United States of

"Clio", etc.,

402 vs.

Amos D. Carver et al., etc.

It is ordered that these cases be argued separately, and that eighty minutes be allowed for the argument of each case, on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf.

Blamberg Brothers, Appellant,

165 vs.

The United States.

This case was argued by Mr. D. Roger Englar for the appellant, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee.

Colonial Beach Company, Owner, etc., Petitioner,

109 vs.

Quemahoning Coal Company et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. H. H. Obear for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. R. E. Preece for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, December 6th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices.
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Atlee Pomerene, it is ordered that J. W. M. Bradford, Esquire, and Maurice F. Lyons, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Selden P. Spencer, it is ordered that Samuel I. Stevens, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry A. Wise, it is ordered that Cola G. Parker, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Herbert W. Clark, it is ordered that James M. Hervey, Esquire, of Albuquerque, State of New Mexico, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick W. Dallinger, it is ordered that Edward E. Clark, Esquire, of Framingham, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W.

Harrold, it is ordered that Ed. M. Frye, Esquire, of Sallisaw, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edmund L. Jones, it is ordered that Fernando B. Fornaris, Esquire, of Ponce, Porto Rico, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

James A. Baker, Receiver, etc., et al.
156 vs.
Karl L. Druesedow, Tax Collector, etc.

It is ordered that this case be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

The United States, Plaintiff in Error,
157 vs.
Ray James et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the plaintiff in error, it is ordered that this case be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

Colonial Beach Company, Owner, etc., Petitioner,
109 vs.
Quemahoning Coal Company et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. J. V. Hewitt for the respondents and concluded by Mr. Hugh H. Obear for the petitioner.

The United States of America, Owner of the Steamship "Clio", etc.,
402 vs.
Amos D. Carver et al., etc.

This case was argued by Mr. Norman B. Beecher for the United States, owner, etc., and by Mr. E. Curtis House for Carver et al. Reply briefs to be filed in three days by the United States, Owner, etc., and in three days thereafter by Carver et al.

Oliver Iron Mining Company, Appellant,
560 vs.
Samuel Lord et al.;
Cleveland-Cliffs Iron Company, Appellant,
561 vs.
Samuel Lord et al.;

Mesaba-Cliffs Iron Mining
Company, Appellant,
562 vs.
Samuel Lord et al.;
Bennett Mining Company
et al., Appellants,
563 vs.
Samuel Lord et al.;
Republic Iron & Steel
Company et al., Appellants,
564 vs.
Samuel Lord et al.;
The Biwabik Mining Company
et al., Appellants,
565 vs.
Samuel Lord et al.; and
Inter-State Iron Company,
Appellant,
566 vs.
Samuel Lord et al.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. C. A. Severance for the appellant in No. 560, and continued by Mr. M. J. Grannis for the appellants in Nos. 561 and 562, by Mr. Oscar Mitchell for the appellants in Nos. 563 and 564, by Mr. Egbert S. Oakley for the appellees, and by Mr. Patrick J. Ryan for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, December 7th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices.
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles L. McNary, it is ordered that Ben C. Dey, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. A. Severance, it is ordered that Albert C. Gillette, Esquire, of Duluth, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph T. Robinson, it is ordered that George E. Cracraft, Esquire, of Eudora, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick W. Lehmann, it is ordered that Lewis T. Stevens, Esquire, of Cape May, State of New Jersey, and Harold K. Bachelder, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, it is ordered that William Henry Langdon, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Oliver Iron Mining Company,
Appellant,
560 vs.
Samuel Lord et al.;
Cleveland-Cliffs Iron
Company, Appellant,
561 vs.
Samuel Lord et al.;
Mesaba-Cliffs Iron Mining
Company, Appellant,
562 vs.
Samuel Lord et al.;
Bennett Mining Company et al.,
Appellants,
563 vs.
Samuel Lord et al.;
Republic Iron & Steel Company
et al., Appellants,
564 vs.
Samuel Lord et al.;
The Biwabik Mining Company
et al., Appellants,
565 vs.
Samuel Lord et al.; and
Inter-State Iron Company,
Appellant,
566 vs.
Samuel Lord et al.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Patrick J. Ryan for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. C. A. Severance for the appellant in No. 560.

John Simon, Appellant,
94 vs.
American Exchange National
Bank et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Henry A. Wise for the appellant, and by Mr. James A. Fowler for the appellees.

Galveston Wharf Company
et al., Appellants,
19 vs.
City of Galveston et al.

This case was argued by Mr. J. W. Terry for the appellants, and by Mr. Frank S. Anderson for the appellees.

St. Louis Malleable Casting Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
154 vs.
George G. Prendergast Construction Company.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Lambert E. Walther for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, December 8th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices.

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

George Sutherland.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Morgan G. Sanders, it is ordered that Fred V. Hughes, Esquire, of Tyler, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merrill Moores, it is ordered that James A. Collins, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl H. Chindblom, it is ordered that Francis L. Brinkman, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert H. Miller, it is ordered that Emile Steinfeld, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, and Henry I. Armstrong, Jr., Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Atlee Pomerene, it is ordered that Edward Herman Brink, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. H. Caraway, it is ordered that Sam B. Wilson, Esquire, of Beaver, State of Pennsylvania, and Stuart Lewis, Esquire, of Cairo, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Henry Butler, it is ordered that Robert C. Watson, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. Miter, it is ordered that John P. Booth, Esquire, of New York City, and Max Fred Burger, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. Russell Alden, it is ordered that Wendell Phillips Haine, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

St. Louis Malleable Casting Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
154 vs.
George C. Prendergast Construction Company.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Lambert E. Walther for the plaintiff in error, and concluded by Mr. William K. Koerner for the defendant in error.

State of Missouri ex rel. Southwestern Bell Telephone Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
158 vs.
Public Service Commission of Missouri et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Frederick W. Lehmann for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. L. H. Breuer and Mr. James D. Lindsay for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. Frederick W. Lehmann for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, December 11th, 1922.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices.

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

George Sutherland.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that Dan M. Link, Esquire, of Auburn, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Frierson, it is ordered that William Walter Frankel, Esquire, of New York City, Elmer L. Brock, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, and Cary H. Alburn, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. C. Calhoun, it is ordered that Clinton M. Harbison, Esquire, of Lexington, State of Kentucky, and John T. Vance, Jr., Esquire, of Lexington, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert Ottinger, it is ordered that Nathaniel L. Goldstein, Esquire, and Charles C. Lockwood, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Homer Guerry, it is ordered that Arthur W. O'Rourke, Esquire, of Helena, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. C. Little, it is ordered that Otis S. Allen, Esquire, of Topeka, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George M. Lanning, it is ordered that Claude M. Bain, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paca Oberlin, it is ordered that Harry G. Sabine, Esquire, of Rockwood, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas Sterling, it is ordered that John B. Hanten, Esquire, of Watertown, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, it is ordered that Frank H. Norcross, Esquire, of Reno, State of Nevada, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Joseph W. Cox, Appellant,
71 vs.
Ethel Hart.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

George B. Kirby, Charles McDaniels,
and United States Fidelity and
Guaranty Company, Plaintiffs in E

126 vs.

The United States of
America for and on behalf
of The Crow Tribe of Indians.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Montana.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Pennsylvania Coal Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
549 vs.
H. J. Mahon and Margaret
Craig Mahon.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Regal Drug Corporation,
Petitioner,
108 vs.
Justus S. Wardell, as United
States Collector of Internal

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

American Mills Company, Petitioner,
118 vs.
American Surety Company of New York.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Champlain Realty Company,
Petitioner,
128 vs.
Town of Brattleboro.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Vermont.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Vermont, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,

39 vs.

Vito Lanza et al.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions to sustain the demurrer to the special plea in bar of the defendants, and for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

The State of Oklahoma,

Complainant,

18, Original. vs.

The State of Texas.

ORDER.

The Receiver is hereby authorized to make the following payments and to charge the same as expenses of the Receivership:

To Nagel & Kirby the sum of two thousand dollars as compensation for services rendered by them between November 21, 1921, and this date;

To McKenney & Flannery the sum of thirteen thousand five hundred dollars as compensation for services rendered by them for the year following December 6, 1921;

And to Frederic A. Delano the sum of thirty thousand dollars on account of his services as Receiver.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. W. Lee, Plaintiff in Error,

422 vs.

Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument, on the summary docket, on Tuesday, January 2d next.

after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry Preygang & Albert A. Trocon, Partners, etc., Appellants,
480 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument with No. 485, heretofore assigned for Monday, February 26th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Texas, Plaintiff in Error,
679 vs.
Eastern Texas Railroad Company et al.
The State of Texas, Appellant,
680 vs.
Eastern Texas Railroad Company et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance these causes, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the causes assigned for argument on Monday, March 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wagner Electric Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
682 vs.
Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Tom Reed Gold Mines Company, Petitioner,
708 vs.
United Eastern Mining Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Union Trust & Savings Bank, as Trustee, etc., Petitioners, vs. The Southern Traction Company of Illinois, et al. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

709

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Barton Payne, Director General of Railroads, etc., Plaintiff in Error, vs. A. E. Stevens et al. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

153

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Appellant, vs. Arthur John Bancroft. — Appeal from the Court of Claims.

151

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel. Aaron Suhonen, Appellant, vs. Frederick A. Wallis, Commissioner — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

139

Monday, December 11th, 1922, continued.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Simon, Appellant,
94 vs.
American Exchange National Bank et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Express Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
123 vs.
Terry Packing Company.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

I. W. Geer et al.,
72 vs.
The United States of America.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, of counsel for The United States of America, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the certificate herein,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said certificate be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Everett et al.
vs.
The United States and United States Shipping Board.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of certiorari herein, and to prosecute same in forma pauperis, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Michael Heitler and others, Plaintiffs in Error, 185 to 189, inclusive.
vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to transfer the record and proceedings herein to the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter Howe in behalf of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, with leave to Mr. Solicitor General Beck to file opposition thereto on or before Friday next if so advised.

Cumberland Telephone & Telegraph Company, Appellant, 650 vs.
Louisiana Public Service Commission et al., etc.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. Garland Dupre in behalf of Mr. Huey P. Long and Mr. Wiley M. Barrow for the appellees.

The State of Georgia, Complainant,
--- Orig'l. vs.
The City of Chattanooga, Tennessee.

The motion for leave to file bill of complaint herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George M. Napier, Mr. Robert H. Williams, Mr. William L. Frierson, and Mr. Joe V. Williams for the complainant.

Gorham Manufacturing Company, Appellant, 196 vs.
James A. Wendell, individually and as Comptroller of the State of New York, et al.

The motion to substitute the State Tax Commission of New York in the case of James A. Wendell, Comptroller of the State of New York, as a party appellee herein, was submitted by Mr. W. W. Bride in behalf of counsel for the appellees.

The State of New York, Complainant,	The motion for leave to amend the original bill and the amended bill of complaint in this cause was submitted by Mr. Adrian Sizer in behalf of counsel for the complainant.
22, Original. vs.	
Harry M. Daugherty, Attorney General of the United States, et al.	
Edgar-Morgan Company, Petitioner,	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph H. Milans, Mr. Arthur E. Wallace, and Mr. Max W. Zabel for the petitioners, and by Mr. H. C. Cook and Mr. Thomas H. Cobbs for the respondent.
712 vs.	
Alfocorn Milling Company.	

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Tuesday, January 2, 1923, at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that Edward J. Cannon, Esquire, of Spokane, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Daniel V. Mahoney, it is ordered that Samuel Silbiger, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Warren, it is ordered that Lionel Aubrey Norman, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Egan, it is ordered that George Harry Cohen, Esquire, of Hartford, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl R. Chindblom, it is ordered that Winfield H. Adams, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis Ottenberg, it is ordered that Jacob J. Podell, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward E. Blodgett, it is ordered that George S. Fuller, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motionfirst made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William G. Brantley, it is ordered that Carl H. Richmond, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. Riter, it is ordered that Malcolm Douglas, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage, it is ordered that John H. Carroll, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George F. Short, it is ordered that John Tomerlin, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas W. Gregory, it is ordered that T. Hardy Todd, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. Edward Wright, it is ordered that Philip A. Weinstein, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Marven Thompson,

it is ordered that A. Howard Neely, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice said:

"Since the last meeting of the Court, the President has nominated, and the Senate has confirmed, Mr. Pierce Butler to be an Associate Justice of this Court to succeed to the vacancy created by the retirement of Mr. Justice Day. Mr. Butler is in attendance, and is ready to take the oath. The Clerk will read the commission."

The Clerk then read the commission, and immediately thereafter the oath of office was administered by Mr. Chief Justice Taft, and Mr. Justice Butler was conducted to his seat on the bench by the Marshal.

Which said commission and oath are in the following words and figures, viz:

"WARREN G. HARDING,

President of the United States of America,

To all who shall see these presents,

Greeting:

KNOW YE: That reposing special trust and confidence in the Wisdom, Uprightness, and Learning of Pierce Butler, of Minnesota, I have nominated and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, do appoint him to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, and do authorize and empower him to execute and fulfil the duties of that Office according to the Constitution and Laws of the said United States, and to Have and to Hold the said office, with all the powers, privileges and emoluments to the same of right appertaining, unto Him, the said Pierce Butler, during his good behavior, commencing December 21, 1922.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have caused these Letters to be made patent and the seal of the Department of Justice to be hereunto affixed.

S E A L

Done at the City of Washington this 21st day of December, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and twenty two, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-seventh.

By the President:

(signed) H. M. DAUGHERTY

(signed) WARREN G. HARDING.

"UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA.

I, Pierce Butler, do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

(Signed) Pierce Butler.

Subscribed and sworn to before me
this 26th day of December, 1922.

(Signed) Wilbur S. Booth,
United States District Judge."

"OATH OF OFFICE FOR UNITED STATES JUDGES.

(Sections 712 and 1757, Revised Statutes.)

"I, Pierce Butler, do solemnly swear that I will administer justice without respect to persons, and do equal right to the poor and to the rich, and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all the duties incumbent on me as Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, according to the best of my abilities and understanding, agreeably to the Constitution and laws of the United States; and that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

(Signed) PIERCE BUTLER.

Subscribed and sworn to before
me, this 2d day of January, 1923.

(Signed) WM. H. TAFT,
Chief Justice of the United States.

Date of birth ----------

Date of entry on duty January 2, 1923. "

Thomas J. Stockley, Robert L. Stringfellow, J. G. Hester, et al., Appellants,
74 vs.
The United States of America.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Sam W. Mason, Lydia Hanszen MacMullen, Eugene Hanszen, et al., Appellants,
117 vs.
The United States of America.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana in this cause be, and the same is hereby, modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court, and, as so modified, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Henry Hunsicker, Charles J. Greene, Jr., Producers Oil Company, et al., Appellants,
104 vs.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

E. C. Palmer, Mrs. Fannie B. Heilperin, Tutrix of Natalie Heilperin, Pure Oil Operating Company, et al., Appellants,
111 vs.
The United States of America.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Arkansas Natural Gas Company,
Sam W. Mason, Mrs. Lydia Hanszen MacMullen, et al., Appellants,
112 vs.
The United States of America.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed

by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

B. R. Norvell, Charles H. Strouck, A. E. Weaver, et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America. — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

113

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

W. H. Matthews, Lydia Hanszen MacMullen, J. A. MacMullen, et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America. — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

114

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Dillard P. Eubank, John B. Files, Eugene Hanszen, et al., Appellants, 115 vs. The United States of America. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Lydia Hanszen MacMullen, J. A. MacMullen, H. Earl Barnes, et al., Appellants, 116 vs. The United States of America. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Jeems Bayou Fishing and Hunting Club, Producers Oil Company, and The Texas Company, Appellants, 119 vs. The United States of America. The United States of America, Appellant, 137 vs.

Jeems Bayou Hunting and
Fishing Club, Producers
Oil Company, and The Texas
Company.

and Cross Appeal
Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, on appeal and cross-appeal, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed: and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Baltimore & Ohio Railroad
Company, Appellant, Appeal from the Court of Claims.
99 vs.
The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Greenport Basin and Construction Company, Plaintiff in Error and Appellant, In Error to and Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York.
31 vs.
The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the

same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Rosenberg Bros. & Company, Inc., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Curtis Brown Company. 102 — In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Southern Railway Company, Appellant, vs. A. D. Watts and A. D. Watts, as Commissioner of Revenue, et al. 368 — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Atlantic and Yadkin Railway Company, Appellant, vs. A. D. Watts and A. D. Watts, as Commissioner of Revenue, et al. 369 — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Appellant,
381 vs.
A. D. Watts and A. D. Watts as Commissioner of Revenue of the State of North Carolina, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Appellant,
382 vs.
A. D. Watts and A. D. Watts, as Commissioner of Revenue of the State of North Carolina, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Norfolk Southern Railroad Company, Appellant,
383 vs.
A. D. Watts and A. D. Watts, as Commissioner of Revenue of the State of North Carolina.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Osaka Shosen Kaisha and United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company, Petitioners,
129 vs.
Pacific Export Lumber Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Charles A. Ramsay Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
100 vs.
Associated Bill Posters of the United States and Canada et al.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

William H. Rankin Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
101 vs.

Associated Bill Posters of
the United States and Canada.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Galveston Wharf Company, et al., Appellants, vs. The City of Galveston et al. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas.

19

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Chris Elioff Stafoff, alias Chris Elioff. — In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri.

26

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the

same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

James L. Brooks
197 vs.
The United States of America.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is the opinion of this Court that the questions certified, 1, 2 and 3, as limited in the opinion of this Court, must be answered in the affirmative; and that question 4 must be answered in the negative.

Whereupon, it is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
403 vs.
George Remus, Harry P. Brown, otherwise called Harry Brown, and A. Brown, George Conners, et al.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court on counts 2, 4 and 6, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed, and on counts 3, 5 and 7, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The United States of America, Owner of the Steamships "Clio", "Mooseabec", "Fort Logan", and "Morganza", et al.,
402 vs.
Amos D. Carver and Joseph B. Morrell,

Copartners doing business
under the firm name and
style of Baker, Carver, and
Morrell.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the questions certified, 1 and 2, must be answered in the negative; and that an answer to questions certified, 3 and 4, is unnecessary.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Kansas City Southern Railway Company, Petitioner,
142 vs.
Elizabeth Van Zant.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

St. Louis Malleable Casting Company, Plaintiff in Error,
154 vs.
George G. Prendergast Construction Company.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and

the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Michael Heitler, Plaintiff in Error, In Error to the District Court of the
185 vs. United States for the Northern District
The United States. of Illinois.

On consideration of the motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to transfer the record and proceedings herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit,

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, transferred to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit at the costs of the plaintiff in error, that Court to be thereupon possessed of the jurisdiction of the same and proceed to the determination of the said writ of error as if such writ had issued out of that Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Nathaniel Perlman, Plaintiff in Error, In Error to the District Court of the
185 vs. United States for the Northern District
The United States. of Illinois.

On consideration of the motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to transfer the record and proceedings herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit,

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, transferred to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit at the costs of the plaintiff in error, that Court to be thereupon possessed of the jurisdiction of the same and proceed to the determination of the said writ of error as if such writ had issued out of that Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mandel Greenberg, Plaintiff in Error, In Error to the District Court of the
187 vs. United States for the Northern District
The United States. of Illinois.

On consideration of the motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to transfer the record and proceedings herein to the United States Circuit

Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit,

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, transferred to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit at the costs of the plaintiff in error, that Court to be thereupon possessed of the jurisdiction of the same and proceed to the determination of the said writ of error as if such writ had issued out of that Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank McCann, Plaintiff in Error, In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

188 vs.

The United States.

On consideration of the motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to transfer the record and proceedings herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit,

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, transferred to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit at the costs of the plaintiff in error, that Court to be thereupon possessed of the jurisdiction of the same and proceed to the determination of the said writ of error as if such writ had issued out of that Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George F. Quinn, Plaintiff in Error, In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

189 vs.

The United States.

On consideration of the motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to transfer the record and proceedings herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit,

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, transferred to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit at the costs of the plaintiff in error, that Court to be thereupon possessed of the jurisdiction of the same and proceed to the determination of the said writ of error as if such writ had issued out of that Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sioux City Bridge Company, Petitioner, vs. Dakota County, Nebraska. 105

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Ernest G. Walker, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Genevieve K. Gish. 135

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Blamberg Brothers, Appellant, vs. The United States of America. 165

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

Colonial Beach Company,
Owner and Claimant of the
Steamer "St. Johns",
Petitioner,
109 vs.
Quemahoning Coal Company
and Coale & Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia, for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts,
Complainant,
20, Original. vs.
The State of New York et al.

The motion of the defendants The City of Rochester; James L. Hotchkiss, Clerk of the County of Monroe in the State of New York; Eugene Van Voorhis, John A. Vanderwerf, and Charles C. Beahan, as Commissioners of Appraisal; New York Central Railroad Company, Central Union Trust Company of New York, Ontario Beach Hotel & Amusement Company, Emil Bomhart, Rebecca Bomhart, Milton J. McIntyre, Belle McIntyre, Bartholomay Company, Inc., and Twentieth Ward Co-operative Savings & Loan Association, that the above-entitled cause be referred to a Special Master, having been heretofore granted,

It is now here ordered by this Court, by agreement of counsel, that Wade H. Ellis, Esquire, be, and he is hereby, appointed Special Master to take proofs and make reports to the Court in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cumberland Telephone &
Telegraph Company, Appellant,
650 vs.

Louisiana Public Service Commission
et al., etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 9th next.

by Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Georgia,
Complainant,
--- Orig'l. vs.
The City of Chattanooga.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gorham Manufacturing Company,
Appellant,
196 vs.
James A. Wendell, Individually and as Comptroller of the State of New York, et al.
of the appellees, in this cause,

On consideration of the suggestion of death of James A. Wendell, Individually and as Comptroller of the State of New York, one of the appellees, and of the motion to substitute the State Tax Commission of the State of New York as one

It is now here ordered by this Court that cause be shown by Gorham Manufacturing Company, the appellant in this cause, before this Court, at the City of Washington, why the case as to the Comptroller should not be dismissed in view of Irwin v. Webb, decided March 20, 1922, and U. S. v. Butterworth, 169 U. S., 600.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of New York, Complainant,
22, Orig'l. vs.
Harry M. Daugherty, Attorney General,
etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to amend the bill of complaint and the amended bill of complaint herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Board of Levee Commissioners
of the Orleans Levee District,
Petitioner,
603 vs.
William H. Ward.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fred P. Violette, Appellant,
676 vs.
James A. Walsh, Collector, etc.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Eddie Harrison et al.,
Petitioners,
691 vs.
Dick Harrison.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edgar-Morgan Company,
Petitioner,
712 vs.
Alfocorn Milling Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Benjamin Gitlow, Plaintiff
in Error,

770 vs.

The People of the State of New York.

It is ordered by this Court that this cause be assigned for argument on Monday, March 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

ORDER.

It is ordered by the court that the accompanying correspondence between members of the court and Mr. Justice Day upon his retirement as an Associate Justice of the court be this day spread upon the record and that it also be printed in the reports of the court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

"December 23, 1922.

Dear Brother Day:

At the end of twenty-five years of judicial work, you have retired to enjoy a well-earned respite from unremitting labor. This you began by one year's service on the Bench of your native State. After a short but conspicuously useful and successful service as Secretary of State during the Spanish War, and as Chairman of the Peace Commission which negotiated the Treaty of Paris closing that War, you went back to judicial work on the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit for four years, whence you were called to this Court in March, 1903. The thorough preparation you had had for effective work here manifested itself at once. Your service has covered two decades. Your opinions appear in sixty-seven volumes of our Reports. But it is not only in the published opinions, their number, their clearness and their force, great as they are, that the value of your service is to be measured. We who have sat with you in conference know how much you have contributed to our counsels from your wealth of judicial experience, your accurate knowledge of the scope of our previous decisions, and your remarkable familiarity with the adjudged limits of our jurisdiction.

We shall miss much your loyalty to the Court and its traditions, your affectionate fellowship, your wit and humor, and your unfailing tranquillity and good sense.

Your separation from the Court is a real personal sorrow to us, and we know that it is to you. To end such a close and confidential relation in a high, arduous and common service to the State and country, extending over many years, must be this when there has ever been present mutual respect and

affection.

We sincerely hope that in your retirement and in a long evening of life, you may find your happiness, as well you may, in your extended and honorable record of public service and in the clear verdict of your countrymen that you have deserved well of the Republic.

Affectionately yours,

(signed) William H. Taft,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James Clark McReynolds,
Louis Dembitz Brandeis,
George Sutherland.

Hon. William R. Day,
1301 Clifton Street,
Washington, D.C."

"1301 Clifton Street,
Washington, D.C.
December 26, 1922.

My dear Brethren:

Your kind letter of the 23rd instant has been received. I am very grateful for this expression of your feeling toward me on the separation which follows my laying down of judicial work.

I need not say that the labors of nearly twenty years of service upon the Court have been necessarily arduous. They have been, nevertheless, enjoyable, and the association and companionship of those with whom they have been performed have been most agreeable to me, and I part with the Court with deep regret that it seems proper for me to take this step at this time.

I can not forego an expression of satisfaction that at no time has any serious inroad been made upon the great and necessary functions of the Court in adjudicating fundamental rights under our system of government, although such power has been the subject of attack during the entire life of the Republic. If our institutions are to endure, as I believe they are, these powers must be lodged in an impartial and independent tribunal.

That you may live long to carry on the great work entrusted to you by the Constitution - is my heartfelt wish as I sever our official associations. For each and all of you I have an affectionate regard and esteem which I shall cherish as long as I shall live.

Cordially and fraternally,

To the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the

(signed) William R. Day.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Complainant, 24, Orig'l. vs. Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury, et al.	The motion to dismiss the original bill herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the defendants in support of the motion.
The United States of America, Petitioner, 191 vs. A. C. Loucks et al.; and The United States of America, Appellant, 192 vs. Charles J. Green, Jr., et al.	On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner and appellant, these cases were advanced for hearing with Nos. 160, 161, 162 and 163.
Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner, 213 vs. Sinclair Refining Company; Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner, 637 vs. Standard Oil Company; Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner, 638 vs. Gulf Refining Company; and Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner, 639 vs. Maloney Oil Manufacturing Company.	The motion to set Nos. 637, 638, and 639 for hearing with No. 213 and to pass No. 213 to be set for argument on Monday, March 5 next, was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioners.
West Side Irrigating Company, Appellant, 54 vs. The United States of America.	Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered,

adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Great Lakes Dredge and Dock Company, Plaintiff in Error,
633 vs.
Sophia Kierejewski, Administratrix, etc.

The motion to advance this cause pursuant to Rule 32 was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. I. W. Cole in that behalf.

The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Appellant,
585 vs.
United States Railroad Labor Board et al.

The motion to reassign this cause was submitted by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for the appellant, and was denied.

Georgia Railway & Power Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
463 vs.
The Town of Decatur: and
Georgia Railway & Power Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
464 vs.
The Mayor & Council of the City of College Park.

The motion to advance these causes was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter T. Colquitt for the plaintiffs in error.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
775 vs.
Mark Boasberg, alias "Jack Sheehan".

Mr. H. Garland Dupre, of counsel for the defendant in error, having filed in open court the following certificate, to wit:

"I, Henry J. Carter, Clerk of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana, do hereby certify that in a certain cause pending in said Court, wherein The United States of America was plaintiff, and Mark Boasberg, alias 'Jack Sheehan', was defendant, a final judgment was rendered by said court on the 7th day of June, A. D. 1922, in favor of the said Mark Boasberg, alias 'Jack Sheehan', and against the said United States of America, and that on the 5th day of July, A. D. 1922, said United

States of America sued out a writ of error to said District Court, directed to remove said cause to the Supreme Court of the United States.

In testimony whereof I hereunto subscribe my name and affix the Seal of said District Court, at New Orleans, La., this 14th day of September, A. D. 1922.

(SEAL). (Signed) H. J. Carter, Clerk,"

and moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the ninth rule,

And it appearing to the Court that the plaintiff in error has failed to have its cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court,

It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana be, and the same is hereby, docketed and dismissed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Cunard Steam Ship Company (Limited) et al., and others, Appellants,
659, 660, 661, 662, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 678, 693, and 694. vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, et al. and others.

On motion of Mr. Wayne B. Wheeler in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief herein as amicus curiae.

W. K. Ephraim et al., Petitioners,
730 vs.
Nevada and California Land & Live Stock Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles J. Kappler for the petitioner and by Mr. Edward Hohfeld for the respondents.

Sperry Oil & Gas Company et al., Appellants,
731 vs.
Pearl Chisholm et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. E. Wright in behalf of Mr. Preston C. West and Mr. Alvin Richards for the appellants, in support of the petition.

Robert T. Meyer, Plaintiff in Error, 325 vs. The State of Nebraska.	The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. D. Drain in behalf of counsel.
Nebraska District of Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and other States, et al., Plaintiffs in Error, 440 vs. Samuel R. McKelvie et al.	The motion to consolidate this case with No.325 was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. D. Drain in behalf of counsel.
James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, etc., Petitioner, 768 vs. McWilliams Bros. (Inc.)	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. Howard Meely and Mr. Chauncey I. Clark for the petitioner, and by Mr. Leo J. Curren, Mr. Henry M. Earle, and Mr. Joseph P. Nolan for the respondent.
United States Railway Administration et al., Petitioners, 705 vs. Fannie Slatinka, Administratrix, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage and Mr. J. C. Gamble for the petitioners, and by Mr. William Chamberlain for the respondent.
The K. W. Ignition Company et al., Petitioners, 719 vs. Temco Electric Motor Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter F. Murray for the petitioners and by Mr. H. A. Toulmin and Mr. H. A. Toulmin, Jr., for the respondent.
Mishawaka Woolen Manufacturing Company, Petitioner, 720 vs. Federal Trade Commission.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry E. Bodman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. W. H. Fuller for the respondent.

Edward J. Ader, Petitioner,
721 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Hamilton Lewis, Mr. Thomas B. Felder, Mr. Edward Maher, and Mr. Jacob Y. Grossberg for the petitioner.

Goldie A. Skolnik, Petitioner,
722 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Hamilton Lewis, Mr. Thomas B. Felder, Mr. Edward Maher, and Mr. Jacob G. Grossberg for the petitioner.

Virginia Railway & Power Company et al., Petitioners,
723 vs.
Charles Hall Davis.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel Seabury, Mr. E. Randolph Williams, and Mr. Thomas B. Gay for the petitioners, and by Mr. James Mann for the respondent.

L. V. Orsinger, Petitioner,
726 vs.
The Consolidated Flour Mills Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Michael F. Gallagher for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward Osgood Brown, Mr. George Packard, and Mr. Cecil Barnes for the respondent.

Security Auto Lock Company et al., Petitioners,
735 vs.
Perry Auto Lock Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles C. Bulkley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward Rector and Mr. Glen E. Smith for the respondent.

Atlantic Transport Company (Limited), Petitioner,
745 vs.
H. C. Jones & Company (Inc.)

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Van Vechten Veeder and Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper for the petitioner.

Antonio Abella et al., Petitioners,
766 vs.
Pedro Unson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Gabriel La O for the petitioners.

Los Angeles Gas & Electric Corporation, Plaintiff in Error.
168 vs.
Department of Public Service of the City of Los Angeles, et al.

This cause was continued, per stipulation of counsel.

The United States of America, Complainant,
25, Orig'l. Vs.
The State of Oklahoma.

This cause was argued on the motion to dismiss by Mr. William H. Zwick for the defendant in support of the motion, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Hiter for the complainant in opposition thereto.

Malcolm Douglas et al., Appellants,
159 vs.
Leon Noble.

This cause was argued by Mr. Malcolm Douglas for the appellants, and case submitted by Mr. Cassius E. Gates for the appellee.

The United States of America, Appellant,
160 vs.
C. W. Lane et al.;
The United States of America, Appellant,
161 vs.
The Gulf Refining Company of Louisiana;
The United States of America, Appellant,
162 vs.
Southwestern Gas and Electric Company;
The United States of America, Appellant,
163 vs.
The Gulf Refining Company of Louisiana;

The United States of America,

Petitioner,

191 vs.

A. C. Loucks et al.; and

The United States of America,

Appellant,

192 vs.

Charles J. Greene, Jr., et al.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Hiter for the United States.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, January 3rd, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John N. Popham, Jr., it is ordered that Leo D. Hermle, Esquire, of Oakland, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
172 vs.
Fruit Growers' Express (Inc.).

On motion of Mr. Assistant Attorney General Riter for the petitioner, this cause was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

The United States, Appellant,
160 vs.
C. W. Lane et al.;
The United States, Appellant,
161 vs.
Gulf Refining Company of
Louisiana;
The United States, Appellant,
162 vs.
Southwestern Gas & Electric
Company et al.;
The United States, Appellant,
163 vs.
Gulf Refining Company of

The United States, Petitioner,
191 vs.
A. C. Loucks et al.; and
The United States, Appellant,
192 vs.
Charles J. Greene, Jr., et al.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Ritor for the United States, continued by Mr. S. L. Herold for the appellees in Nos. 160, 161, 162, and 163, and respondents in No. 191; and concluded by Mr. Elias Goldstein for the appellees in No. 192.

Donald M. Hill et al., Petitioners,
164 vs.
Charles S. Smith.

This cause was argued by Mr. George S. Fuller for the petitioners, and by Mr. Edward F. McClennen for the respondent.

H. C. Koller, Appellant,
166 vs.
The United States of America.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington, and the appellant having been three times solemnly called by the Marshal to come into Court and prosecute his appeal, and failing to appear, it is, thereupon, in pursuance of the 16th Rule of this Court, and on the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck, of counsel for the appellee, now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Bankers Trust Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
169 vs.
William H. Blodgett, Tax Commissioner, etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. W. H. Comley for the plaintiffs in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

United States ex rel. Workingmen's Cooperative Publishing Association,
Plaintiff in Error,
171 vs.
Albert S. Burleson, Postmaster General

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Thursday, January 4th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler.
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that Thomas A. Sherman, Esquire, and Francis A. McGurk, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank K. Nebeker, it is ordered that Theodore H. Thiesing, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Vaile, it is ordered that Edward H. Ellis, Esquire, of Greybull, State of Wyoming, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation,
Plaintiff in Error,
124 vs.
John E. Sullivan; and
The United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation,
Petitioner,
93 vs.
John E. Sullivan.

These cases were argued by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the plaintiff in error and petitioner, and by Mr. Samuel Scoville, Jr., for the defendant in error and respondent.

Brush Electric Company,
Appellant,
179 vs.
City of Galveston et al.

This cause was passed, per stipulation of counsel.

St. Louis Southwestern
Railway Company, Appellant,
184 vs.
The United States.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee, this cause was passed, pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

Cunard Steamship Company
(Limited), et al.,
Appellants,
659 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary,
etc., et al.;
Oceanic Steam Navigation
Company (Limited),
Appellant,
660 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary,
etc., et al.;
International Navigation
Company (Limited), Appellant,
661 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary,
etc., et al.;
Compania Generale Transatlantique,
Appellant,
662 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary, etc.,
et al.;
The Netherlands-American Steam
Navigation Company, Appellant,
666 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary, etc.,
et al.;
Liverpool, Brazil & River Plate

Appellant,

667 vs.

Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary, etc.,

et al.;

The Royal Mail Steam Packet Company,

Appellant,

668 vs.

Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary, etc.,

et al.;

United Steamship Company of Copen-

hagen, Appellant,

669 vs.

Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary, etc.,

et al.;

The Pacific Steam Navigation

Company, Appellant,

770 vs.

Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary, etc.,

et al.; and

Navigazione Generale Italiana,

Appellant,

778 vs.

Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary, etc.,

et al.

The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. George W. Wickersham for the appellants, continued by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. George W. Wickersham for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, January 5th, 1912.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler.
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John M. Woolsey, it is ordered that Earl B. Barnes, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. P. I. Campbell, it is ordered that Thomas J. Flannelly, Esquire, of Independence, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. C. Little, it is ordered that Rufus Hardy, Esquire, of Corsicana, and Brantly Harris, Esquire, of Galveston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank B. Kellogg, it is ordered that Pierce Butler, Jr., Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Townsend, it is ordered that Swuby L. Lawton, Esquire, of Hancock, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Gorham Manufacturing Company, Appellant, 196 vs. James A. Wendell, etc.	On motion of Mr. W. W. Bride in that behalf, this cause was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.
International Mercantile Marine Company, Appellant, 693 vs. H. C. Stuart, Acting Collector of Customs for the Port of New York, et al.; and United American Lines (Inc.) et al., Appellants, 694 vs. H. C. Stuart, Acting Collector of Customs for the Port of New York, et al.	The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Cletus Keating for the appellant in No. 693; continued by Mr. Reid L. Carr for the appellants in No. 694, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellees, and concluded by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the appellees.
J. W. Lee, Plaintiff in Error, 422 vs. Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company.	This cause was argued by Mr. Allan D. Cole for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. E. L. Worthington for the defendant in error.
Clyde Chandler, Plaintiff in Error, 173 vs. The State of Texas; Clyde Chandler, Plaintiff in Error, 174 vs. The State of Texas: John Chandler, Plaintiff in Error, 175 vs. The State of Texas; and John Chandler, Plaintiff in Error, 176 vs. The State of Texas.	These cases were submitted by Mr. J. M. Edwards for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. W. A. Keeling for the defendant in error.
Eibel Process Company, Petitioner, 178 vs. Minnesota & Ontario Paper Company.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Frederick P. Fish for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until

Monday, January 8th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler. — Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that Alphonso A. Tenner, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. A. McLaughlin, it is ordered that John B. Doyle, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl H. Chindblom, it is ordered that Robert N. Erskine, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William A. Oldfield, it is ordered that Joe S. Harris, Esquire, and Lamar Williamson, Esquire, of Monticello, and Elbert Godwin, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank H. Moore, it is ordered that Charles M. Blackmar, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, it is ordered that Herbert A. Taylor, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George M. Morris, it is ordered that Ward N. Choate, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph E. Brown, it is ordered that Wynne F. Clouse, Esquire, of Cookeville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rush L. Holland, it is ordered that N. Walter Dixon, Esquire, of Denver, and John R. Clark, Esquire, of Meeker, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

American Railway Express Company, Petitioner, vs. A. J. Lindenburg. — On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

138

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court of Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner, vs. The Curtis Publishing Company. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

85

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:
Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Great Lakes Dredge and Dock Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
633 vs.
Sophia Kierejewski, Administratrix, etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 19th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Georgia Railway & Power Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
463 vs.
The Town of Decatur.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 16th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Georgia Railway & Power Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
464 vs.
The Mayor and Council of the City of College Park.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 16th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert T. Meyer, Plaintiff in Error,
325 vs.
The State of Nebraska.

Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio,
and other States, et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
440 vs.
Samuel R. McKelvie et al., etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance and consolidate these cases,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, February 19th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
215 vs.
Sinclair Refining Company.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
637 vs.
Standard Oil Company.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
638 vs.
Gulf Refining Company.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
639 vs.
Maloney Oil Manufacturing
Company.

On consideration of the motion to pass case No. 215, and to advance and consolidate these cases for argument,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, March 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts,
Complainant,
24, Orig'l. vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury, et al.

On consideration of the motion to dismiss herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause be assigned for argument on said motion to dismiss on Monday, January 22d next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Clyde Chandler, Plaintiff in
Error,

The State of Texas.

In Error to the Court of Criminal Appeals of the State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Criminal Appeals of the State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Criminal Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Clyde Chandler, Plaintiff in Error, 174 vs. The State of Texas. In Error to the Court of Criminal Appeals of the State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Criminal Appeals of the State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Criminal Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Chandler, Plaintiff in Error, 175 vs. The State of Texas. In Error to the Court of Criminal Appeals of the State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Criminal Appeals of the State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Criminal Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Chandler, Plaintiff in Error, 176 vs. The State of Texas. In Error to the Court of Criminal Appeals of the State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Criminal Appeals of the State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this

Court that the judgment of the said Court of Criminal Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The K. W. Ignition Company et al., Petitioners, vs. Temco Electric Motor Company. 719 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward J. Ader, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 721 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Goldie A. Skolnik, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 722 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Virginia Railway & Power Company et al., Petitioners, vs. Charles Hall Davis. 723 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that

the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

L. V. Orninger, Petitioner, vs. The Consolidated Flour Mills Company. 726

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Security Auto Lock Company et al., Petitioners, vs. Perry Auto Lock Company. 735

On petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Atlantic Transport Company (Limited), Petitioner, vs. H. C. Jones & Company (Inc.). 745

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Antonio Abella et al., Petitioners, vs. Pedro Unson. 766

On petition for writ of certiorari to The Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel

thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, etc., Petitioner,
768 vs.
McWilliams Bros. (Inc.).

On petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United States Railway Administration and John Barton Payne, as Director General, etc., Petitioners,
705 vs.
Fannie Slatinka, Administratrix, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied, because the case abates for failure to substitute successor of petitioner within one year after petitioner vacated office.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. K. Ephraim et al., Petitioners,
730 vs.
Nevada and California Land and Live Stock Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied for failure to file the petition within the time prescribed by the statute.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mishawaka Woolen Manufacturing
Company, Petitioner,
720 vs.
Federal Trade Commission.

PER CURIAM:

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit is denied.

The Solicitor General, in his brief for the Federal Trade Commission, concedes that the order affirmed by the Circuit Court of Appeals is broader than the decision in Federal Trade Commission v. Beech-Nut Packing Company, 257 U. S. 455, which the Circuit Court of Appeals followed in dismissing the petition for the Woolen Manufacturing Company. The Court denies the application for writ of certiorari herein, assuming that the Federal Trade Commission will modify its order accordingly, and without prejudice to an application for that purpose by the petitioner.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mishawaka Woolen Manufacturing Company, Petitioner, 720 vs. Federal Trade Commission. — On petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied, without prejudice, &c.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

O R D E R.

IT IS NOW HERE ORDERED BY THIS COURT that the cases, viz., Nos. 310, 311, and 320, heretofore placed on the summary docket, be, and they are hereby, assigned for argument on Monday, February 19th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles M. Waters, Appellant, 256 vs. Henry W. Phillips et al. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. G. Spalding & Bros.,
Plaintiff in Error,
710 vs.
William H. Edwards, Collector, etc.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the defendant in error.

Joslin Manufacturing Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
219 vs.
Walter L. Clarke, City Treasurer,
et al.;
Scituate Light & Power Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
220 vs.
City of Providence et al.;
Theresa B. Joslin, Plaintiff in
Error,
221 vs.
City of Providence et al.

These cases were passed per stipulation of counsel, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

Alexander McDougall, Petitioner,
780 vs.
Oliver Iron Mining Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Merritt Starr and Mr. Horace C. Stone for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederick P. Fish, Mr. D. Anthony Usina, and Mr. Henry M. Huxley for the respondent.

Charles Wolff Packing Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
739 vs.
Court of Industrial Relations of
the State of Kansas.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward S. Gann inbehalf of counsel.

Pangborn Corporation, Petitioner,
757 vs.
The W. W. Sly Manufacturing
Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William P. Hall and Mr. Melville Church for the petitioner,

and by Mr. Charles E. Brock for the respondent; with leave to counsel for the petitioner to file a reply brief on the 9th instant.

F. E. Markell, Petitioner,
746 vs.
D. M. Hertzog et al.,
Trustees in Bankruptcy, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., and Mr. E. C. Higbee for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. Leo Weil for the respondent; with leave to counsel for the petitioner to file a reply brief on or before Wednesday next.

The Standard Parts Company,
Petitioner,
718 vs.
William J. Bock.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John M. Garfield, Mr. A. W. Cannon, and Mr. James P. Wood for the petitioner.

G. H. Baker et al.,
Petitioners,
748 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. L. Miller for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Marlboro Cotton Mills,
Petitioner,
752 vs.
The Firestone Tire & Rubber
Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry E. Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. D. W. Robinson and Mr. Amos C. Miller for the respondents.

M. D. Wandell, Petitioner,
753 vs.
New Haven Trap Rock Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. Catesby Jones and Mr. C. Andrade, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Pierre M. Brown and Mr. George E. Hall for the respondent.

Addie B. Myers, Petitioner,
761 vs.
Lena M. Vayette et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Morse Ives for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lester H. Strawn for the respondents.

Exchange Oil Company, Appellant,
12 vs.
F. C. Carter, as State Auditor, etc., et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Exchange Oil Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
13 vs.
F. C. Carter, as State Auditor, etc.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Exchange Oil Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
14 vs.
F. C. Carter, as State Auditor, etc.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Exchange Oil Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
15 vs.
F. C. Carter, as State Auditor, etc.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Corvallis Creamery Company, Appellant, vs. I. H. Van Winkle, Attorney General, etc., et al. 206

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed without costs to any of the parties.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kansas City Bridge Company, Appellant, vs. Frank Blakemore. 612

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hibel Process Company, Petitioner, vs. Minnesota & Ontario Paper Company. 178

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Frederick P. Fish for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. Amasa C. Paul for the respondent.

A. Bourjois & Company (Inc.),
Petitioner,
190 vs.
Anna Katzel.

The motion for leave to file brief herein as amicus curiae was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. Blum in that behalf, and the motion was denied.

A. Bourjois & Company (Inc.),
Petitioner,
190 vs.
Anna Katzel.

On motion of Mr. John B. Doyle for the respondent, leave was granted to file brief herein within one week. This cause was argued by Mr. Hans V. Briesen for the petitioner, and by Mr. John B. Doyle for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, January 9th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler. — Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Phil D. Swing, it is ordered that John Stewart Ross, Esquire, of El Centro, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William W. Dodge, it is ordered that Lindell T. Bates, Esquire, of Mount Lebanon, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad
Company, Appellant,
724 vs.
A. D. Watts, Commissioner of
Revenue, etc., et al.;
Norfolk Southern Railroad
Company, Appellant,
727 vs.
A. D. Watts, Commissioner,
etc., et al.;
Seaboard Air Line Railway
Company, Appellant,
744 vs.
A. D. Watts, Commissioner of

Southern Railway Company, Appellant,
756 vs.
A. D. Watts, Commissioner of
Revenue, etc., et al.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George H. Brown in that behalf.

David Lamar, Appellant,
201 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Thomas B. Felder in that behalf, it is ordered that this case be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

Henry J. Conley, Plaintiff in Error,
193 vs.
Llewellyn Barton.

This case was submitted by Mr. Harry A. Hegarty and Mr. James B. Flynn for the plaintiff in error, with leave to counsel for the defendant in error to file a brief herein within ten days.

The Kansas City Southern Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
194 vs.
Harry B. Wolf et al.

This case was argued by Mr. F. H. Moore for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Charles M. Blackmar for the defendants in error.

The Western & Atlantic Railroad, Appellant,
195 vs.
The Railroad Commission of
Georgia et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Fitzgerald Hall for the appellant. No brief was filed for the appellees.

Frank Hicks, Appellant,
198 vs.
E. H. Dempsey, Keeper of the
Arkansas State Penitentiary; and
Frank Moore et al., Appellants,
199 vs.
E. H. Dempsey, Keeper of the
Arkansas State Penitentiary.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. U. S. Bratton for the appellants, continued by Mr. Moorfield Storey for the appellants, and by Mr. Elbert Godwin for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Moorfield Storey for the appellants.

The Akron, Canton & Youngstown Railway Company et al.,
Appellants,
646 vs.
The United States of America et al.

On motion of Mr. Walter C. Noyes in that behalf, four and one-half hours were allowed for the argument of this case. The argument was commenced by Mr. Walter C. Noyes for the appellants.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, January 10th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler.
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Roberson, it is ordered that J. Morgan Stevens, Esquire, of Jackson, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merrill Moores, it is ordered that Hinkle C. Hays, Esquire, and W. Paul Stratton, Esquire, of Sullivan, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Townsend, it is ordered that Oscar A. Riopelle, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Oscar J. Larson, it is ordered that William E. Tracy, Esquire, of Duluth, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Akron, Canton & Youngstown Railway Company et al., Appellants,

646 vs.

The United States et al.

On motion of Mr. Walker D. Hines in that behalf, additional brief for the Interstate Commerce Commission was filed in this cause.

Board of Public Utility Commissioners of New Jersey, Appellant, 204 vs. Public Service Railway Company.

This case was passed, per stipulation of counsel.

The Akron, Canton & Youngstown Railway Company, et al., Appellants, 646 vs. The United States et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Walter C. Noyes for the appellants, by Mr. Herbert A. Taylor for the Erie Railroad Company and the Chicago & Erie Railroad Company, by Mr. Alexander H. Elder for the Central Railroad Company of New Jersey, by Mr. Charles F. Choate, Jr., for the Boston & Maine Railroad et al., by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the United States, by Mr. Walker D. Hines for the Interstate Commerce Commission, and concluded by Mr. Walter C. Noyes for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, January 11th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler.
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, it is ordered that John Moore Murrell, Esquire, of Miami, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry L. Underwood, it is ordered that John B. Arnold, Esquire, of Duluth, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jerry A. Mathews, it is ordered that John H. Kiplinger, Esquire, of Rushville, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry L. Myers, it is ordered that Robert S. McKellar, Esquire, of Glasgow, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earl C. Michener, it is ordered that Herman A. Schmier, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Appellant, 208 vs. The United States.	On motion of Mr. Blackburn Esterline in that behalf, it is ordered that this case be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.
Willard, Sutherland & Company, Appellant, 209 vs. The United States.	This case was passed , per stipulation of counsel.
The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Appellant, 585 vs. United States Railroad Labor Board et al.	This case was argued by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for the appellant, and by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the appellees.
Henry E. Stevens, Jr., Petitioner, 200 vs. Arthur S. Arnold et al.	This case was passed, per stipulation of counsel.
The United States, Plaintiff in Error, 157 vs. Ray James et al.	This case was argued by Mr. H. L. Underwood for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. N. Walter Dixon for the defendants in error.
The United States 202 vs. Bhagat Singh Thind.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for The United States.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, January 12th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler.
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David F. Simpson, it is ordered that Clark R. Fletcher, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merrill Moores, it is ordered that Mrs. Emma Eaton White, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. B. Swank, it is ordered that W. L. Chapman, Esquire, of Shawnee, and Hubert L. Bolen, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Melville Church, it is ordered that Frank L. Weil, Esquire, William A. Hims, Esquire, Henry L. Moses, Esquire, and Herman G. Kopald, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Board of Trade of the City of Chicago, et al., Appellants,
701 vs.
Charles F. Clyne, United States Attorney, etc., et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellees, it is ordered that this case be reassigned for argument on February 19th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Complainant, 24, Original. vs. Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury, et al.	The order heretofore entered in this cause, assigning the cause for argument on the motion to dismiss, is vacated.
Charles Butters et al., Plaintiffs in Error, 210 vs. City of Oakland et al.	This case was continued, per stipulation of counsel.
The United States 202 vs. Bhagat Singh Thind.	The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the United States, by Mr. William R. King for Bhagat Singh Thind, and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the United States.
Olga Gathmann Foley et al., Appellants, 203 vs. The United States.	This case was argued by Mr. Charles J. Pence for the appellants, and by Mr. Melville D. Church for the appellee.
Minnesota Commercial Men's Association, Petitioner, 103 vs. Minnie Mae Benn, as Executrix, etc.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. A. V. Ricke for the petitioner, continued by Mr. David F. Simpson for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. A. A. Tenner for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, January 15th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler.
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merrill Moores, it is ordered that Robert A. Buhler, Esquire, of Fort Wayne, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James M. Sheridan, it is ordered that Eusebio C. Barba, Esquire, of Manila, Philippine Islands, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Horace T. Jones, it is ordered that Rowland W. Pixel, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Norman Fischer, it is ordered that F. A. W. Ireland, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lee S. Overman, it is ordered that Henry G. Connor, Jr., Esquire, of Wilson, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Walsh, it is ordered that Laurence H. Axman, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. Riter, it is ordered that R. Calder Mackay, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas W. Gregory, it is ordered that Selden Leavell, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Marion C. Early, it is ordered that Max Haas, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Snake Creek Mining and Tunnel Company, Petitioner,
68 vs.
Midway Irrigation Company and Wilford Van Wagenen.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Utah.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
18, Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

IT IS ORDERED BY THIS COURT that the matter of running, locating, and marking the boundary upon the ground in accordance with the principles stated in the opinion of this Court be referred to three Commissioners to be appointed by the Court, their action to be

subject to its approval; the parties to submit within thirty days a form of decree to carry its conclusions into effect.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Donald M. Hill, Jay R. Benton, and George B. Billings, Executors of the Will of Warren M. Hill, Petitioners,
164 vs.
Charles S. Smith.

On writ of certiorari to the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Superior Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

A. G. Spalding & Brothers,
Plaintiff in Error,
710 vs.
William H. Edwards, Collector, etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 9th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Wolff Packing Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
739 vs.
Court of Industrial Relations of the State of Kansas.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 23d next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Appellant,
724 vs.
A. D. Watts, Commissioner of Revenue, etc., et al.

Norfolk Southern Railroad
Company, Appellant,
727 vs.
A. D. Watts, Commissioner of
Revenue, etc., et al.;
Seaboard Air Line Railway
Company, Appellant,
744 vs.
A. D. Watts, Commissioner of
Revenue, etc., et al.
Southern Railway Company,
Appellant,
756 vs.
A. D. Watts, Commissioner of
Revenue, etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance these causes, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the causes assigned for argument on Monday, April 16th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Standard Parts Company,
Petitioner,
718 vs.
William J. Beck.

On petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

F. E. Markell, Petitioner,
746 vs.
D. M. Hertzog et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

G. R. Baker et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America.

748

On petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Marlboro Cotton Mills, Petitioner, vs. The Firestone Tire & Rubber Company et al.

752

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

M. D. Wandell, Petitioner, vs. New Haven Trap Rock Company.

753

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pangborn Corporation, Petitioner, vs. The W. W. Sly Manufacturing Company.

757

On petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Addie B. Myers, Petitioner,

Lena M. Vayette et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alexander McDougall, Petitioner, vs. Oliver Iron Mining Company. 780

On petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Ray James et al. 157

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Colorado.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Colorado, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Leroy W. Walter. 223

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the plaintiff in error, this case was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

Omnia Commercial Company (Inc.), Appellant, vs. 229

This case was passed pursuant to stipulation of counsel.

Esgee Company of China et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error and Appellants,
706 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the defendant in error.

Hanclaire Trading Corporation et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error and Appellants,
707 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the defendant in error.

Henry P. Reed et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
319 vs.
Village of Hibbing et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank B. Kellogg in behalf of Mr. C. A. Severance, Mr. H. B. Fryberger, Mr. George W. Morgan, and Mr. Oscar Mitchell for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. H. V. Mercer for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Albert & J. M. Anderson Manufacturing Company, Appellant,
740 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance this cause for argument with Nos. 480 and 485 was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. W. Maupin in that behalf.

Emanuel Wallin, Petitioner,
751 vs.
Rose Everett.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Halvor Steenerson and Mr. Charles R. Fowler for the petitioner, and by Mr. Marshall A. Spooner and Mr. Patrick H. Loughran for the respondent, with leave to counsel for the petitioner to file printed record when completed.

William A. Prendergast et al., etc.,
Appellants,
542 vs.
New York Telephone Company.

On motion of Mr. Harry Hertzoff in behalf of the City of New York, leave was granted to file brief herein as amicus curiae.

Max Hart, Appellant,
763 vs.
B. F. Keith Vaudeville Exchange, Orpheum Circuit (Inc.), et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the court by Mr. Louis B. Eppstein and Mr. Laurence H. Axman for the

Jesse C. Adkins et al., etc.,
Appellants,
795 vs.
The Children's Hospital of the District of Columbia; and
Jesse C.Adkins et al., etc.,
Appellants,
796 vs.
Willie A. Lyons.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. H. Stephens in that behalf.

The Wichita Railroad & Light Company, Appellant,
27 vs.
The Public Utilities Commission of the State of Kansas et al.

The motion to stay issuance of the mandate in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry M. Ward in support of the motion, and by Mr. William J. Graham in opposition thereto.

John Endicott et al.,
Petitioners,
700 vs.
The Board of Assessors of the City of Detroit et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. P. J. M. Hally for the petitioners, and by Mr. Walter Barlow and Mr. Clarence E. Wilcox for the respondents.

William Filene's Sons Company,
Petitioner,
733 vs.
Gilchrist Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George H. Hutter and Mr. Jacob J. Kaplan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Alexander Lincoln and Mr. Sherman L. Whipple for the respondent.

Wagner Electric Manufacturing Company, Appellant,
738 vs.
Lemar Lyndon et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Houts for the appellant in support of the petition with leave to counsel for the petitioner to file printed record when completed.

Central Coal & Coke Company,
Petitioner,
749 vs.
Jacob Ocepek.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. C. Boyle for the petitioner.

Nehalem Steamship Company,

765 vs.
Aktieselskabet Aggi, et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George W. Wickersham, Mr. Ira A. Campbell, Mr. Edward J. McCutchen, and Mr. Farnham P. Griffith for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edmund B. McClanahan, Mr. S. Hasket Derby, Mr. William Denman, and Mr. Stanley Moore for the respondents.

Dolly McCalmot, Administratrix, etc., Petitioner,
773 vs.
Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David F. Anderson for the petitioner, and by Mr. William B. Sanders and Mr. Thomas M. Kirby for the respondent.

Taubel-Scott-Kitzmiller Company, Inc., Petitioner,
781 vs.
David J. Fox et al., Trustees, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank J. Hogan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Irving L.Ernst for the respondents.

Prestonettes (Inc.), Petitioner,
793 vs.
Francois Joseph de Spoturno Coty.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Tuttle and Mr. William J. Hughes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hugo Mock and Mr.Asher Blum for the respondent.

Des Moines National Bank, Plaintiff in Error,
212 vs.
Thomas Fairweather, Mayor, et al., etc.

This cause was passed pursuant to stipulation of counsel.

Commonwealth Trust Company of Pittsburgh, Appellant,
216 vs.
Max Smith et al.

This cause was passed pursuant to stipulation of counsel.

Twin Falls Salmon River Land & Water Company, Appellant, vs. A. R. Caldwell et al.	This cause was passed pursuant to stipulation of counsel.
217	
William C. Atwater & Company (Inc.), Appellant, vs. The United States.	This cause was passed pursuant to stipulation of counsel.
218	
John J. McGrath et al., Appellants, vs. The United States.	This cause was submitted by Mr. Elijah N. Zoline for the appellants, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.
222	
The Bank of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Whitney Central National Bank.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Henry Root Stern for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. Martin Conboy for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. J. Blanc Monroe for the defendant in error.
205	
Fred W. Cramer et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. C. F. R. Ogilby for the appellants, and continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Hiter for the appellee.
207	

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, January 16th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler. Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. F. R. Ogilby, it is ordered that Louis H. Halperin, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard P. Ernst, it is ordered that J. W. Cammack, Esquire, of Owenton, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Wichita Railroad & Light Company, Appellant,
27 vs.
Public Utilities Commission of the State of Kansas et al.

The motion to stay the mandate herein was granted until Monday, January 22, 1923, provided petition for rehearing is presented on or before that date.

Security Savings Bank, Plaintiff in Error,
224 vs.
The State of California.

This cause was passed pursuant to stipulation of counsel.

Fred W. Schutz et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
226 vs.
Justus S. Wardell, United States

On motion of Mr. C. C. Heltman in that behalf, this cause was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

Peters Trust Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
227 vs.
The County of Douglas, in the State of Nebraska.

This case was submitted by Mr. John F. Stout, Mr. Halleck F. Rose, Mr. Arthur R. Wells, and Mr. Paul L. Martin for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. William C. Lambert for the defendant in error.

Fred W. Cramer et al.,
Appellants,
207 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Riter for the appellee and concluded by Mr. Frank Thunen for the appellants.

Hattiesburg Grocery Company, Plaintiff in Error,
214 vs.
Stokes V. Robertson, State Revenue Agent, etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. J. Morgan Stevens for the defendant in error and case submitted by Mr. J. Marcellus Green and Mr. Garner W. Green for the plaintiff in error.

C. E. Roy et al., etc.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
215 vs.
E. F. Ganahl.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, and the plaintiffs in error having been three times solemnly called by the Marshal to come into Court and prosecute their writ of error, and failing to appear, it is, thereupon, in pursuance of the 16th rule of this Court, and on the motion of Mr. Alexander T. Vogelsang, of counsel for the defendant in error, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louis Brownlow et al.,
Commissioners of the District of Columbia, et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
95 vs.
Wallis Schwartz.

This cause was argued by Mr. Robert L. Williams for the plaintiffs in error and by Mr. W. Gwynn Gardiner for the defendant in error.

Wabash Railway Company, Petitioner,
225 vs.
Miles Elliott.

This cause was argued by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for the petitioner and by Mr. M. J. O'Donnell for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, January 17th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Daniel Thew Wright, it is ordered that Philip Ershler, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. W. Witten, it is ordered that Augustus S. Dennison, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Challen B. Ellis, it is ordered that Clark C. Clouse, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Crown Die & Tool Company,
Petitioner,
240 vs.
Nye Tool & Machine Works.

The motion of Mr. Richard A. Ford for leave to file brief herein as amicus curiae was denied.

The United States,
Appellant,
251 vs.
Bernard L. Moran.

This cause was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

The United States,

232 vs.
Will J. Allen.

This cause was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

Porto Rico Coal Company (Inc.),
Plaintiff in Error,
233 vs.
William H. Edwards, Collector
of United States Internal Revenue,
etc.

This cause was passed for settlement.

The Washington Terminal Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
234 vs.
Emma C. Callahan, Administratrix,
etc.

This cause was passed for settlement.

Madera Sugar Pine Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
235 vs.
Industrial Accident Commission of
California et al.

This cause was passed pursuant to stipulation of counsel.

Rindge Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
237 vs.
County of Los Angeles.

This cause was passed pursuant to stipulation of counsel.

James C. Davis, Director General,
etc., Petitioner,
228 vs.
L. N. Dantzler Lumber Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. R. C. Beckett for the petitioner, and case submitted by Mr. W. A. White for the respondent; with leave to counsel for the petitioner to file brief within three days.

Abe Raskin, Plaintiff in Error,
230 vs.
Merritt W. Dixon, Sheriff, etc.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and no counsel appearing and no brief having been filed in this Court for either

party in this cause,

It is considered by the Court that this cause should be dismissed at the costs of the plaintiff in error, pursuant to the 18th rule of this Court.

Whereupon, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Concrete Steel Company,
Petitioner,
238 vs.
George E. Vandenburg; and
George E. Vandenburgh,
Petitioner,
273 vs.
Truscon Steel Company.

On motion of Mr. Melville D. Church in that behalf, the time within which to file brief herein as amicus curiae was extended until tomorrow. The argument was commenced by Mr. Thomas J. Johnston for Concrete Steel Company, continued by Mr. O. Ellery Edwards for Vandenburgh, by Mr. F. W. Guthrie for the Truscon Steel Company, by Mr. C. P. Griffin for Vandenburgh, and concluded by Mr. Thomas J. Johnston for Concrete Steel Company.

Crown Die & Tool Company,
Petitioner,
240 vs.
Nye Tool & Machine Works.

The argument of this case was commenced by Miss Florence King for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, January 18th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler.
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred L. Geiger, it is ordered that Jerome E. Malino, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry F. Ashurst, it is ordered that George W. Nilsson, Esquire, of Prescott, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Eugene Ferry Smith, it is ordered that Clyde Grady, Esquire, of Henderson, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles K. Wheeler, it is ordered that W. A. Berry, Esquire, of Paducah, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John K. Shields, it is ordered that Norman Farrell, Esquire, of Nashville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George A. Chritton, it is ordered that Russell Wiles, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

David H. Conrad, Plaintiff in Error,
241 vs.
The People of the State of Illinois.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and no counsel appearing and no brief having been filed in this Court for either party in this cause,

It is considered by the Court that this cause should be dismissed at the costs of the plaintiff in error, pursuant to the 18th rule of this Court.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sam Winokur, Plaintiff in Error,
244 vs.
H. L. Harn, Sheriff, etc., et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, it is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Elmer P. Adams, Plaintiff in Error,
247 vs.
The People of the State of Illinois.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript

of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pecos Water Users' Association, Appellant,
249 vs.
L. A. Swigart et al.

This cause was passed pursuant to stipulation of counsel.

Mangum Electric Company, Appellant,
250 vs.
Campbell Russell, et al.

This cause was passed pursuant to stipulation of counsel.

Crown Die & Tool Company, Petitioner,
240 vs.
Nye Tool & Machine Works.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Russell Wiles for the respondent, and concluded by Miss Florence King for the petitioner.

Samuel Lumiere, Appellant,
242 vs.
Mae Edna Wilder (Inc.).

This cause was argued by Mr. F. F. Church for the appellee, and cause submitted by Mr. W. S. Evans for the appellant, with leave to counsel for the appellee to file brief within one day.

City of Paducah et al., Appellants,
243 vs.
Paducah Railway Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. W. A. Berry for the appellants, and by Mr. Charles K. Wheeler for the appellee.

Leigh Ellis & Company, Plaintiff in Error,
246 vs.
James C. Davis, as Agent, etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Edgar Watkins for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. W. T. Colquitt for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, January 19th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler. Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. C. Calhoun, it is ordered that Jordan Stokes, Jr., Esquire, of Nashville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Theodore K. Bryant, it is ordered that Kenneth C. Newman, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry G. Miller, it is ordered that Cyrus A. Geers, Esquire, and M. Lester Geers, Esquire, of Edwardsville, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. B. Swank, it is ordered that Victor A. Sniggs, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, it is ordered that Helen Weat Bradlee, and Eliot H. Robinson, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. P. J. McCumber, it is ordered that Edward F. Flynn, Esquire, of Devils Lake, State of North Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh H. Obear, it is ordered that Eugene Berry, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James S. Manning, it is ordered that John H. Manning, Esquire, of Raleigh, and William L. Foushee, Esquire, of Durham, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jones Fuller, it is ordered that Sidney C. Chambers, Esquire, of Durham, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Bass, Ratcliff & Gretton (Ltd.), Plaintiff in Error,
259 vs.
State Tax Commission.

On motion of Mr. W. W. Bride in that behalf, it is ordered that this cause be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

Judson Knox, Plaintiff in Error,
252 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Hugh H. Obear in that behalf, it is ordered that this case be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

M. Frank Andrews, Plaintiff in Error,
253 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Hugh H. Obear in that behalf, it is ordered that this case be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

Charles Hunter, Plaintiff in Error,
255 vs.
The Weil Corset Company (Inc.).

On motion of Mr. Benjamin Slade for the defendant in error, leave was granted to make oral argument and file brief for the defendant in error hereafter.

Albert B. Fall, Secretary of the Interior, et al., Appellants,
258 vs.
The United States ex rel. McAllister-Edwards Coal Company.

This cause was passed pursuant to stipulation of counsel.

Cumberland Telephone & Telegraph Company, Appellant,
650 vs.
Louisiana Public Service Commission et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Leigh Ellis & Company, Plaintiff in Error,
246 vs.
James C. Davis, as Agent, etc.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. W. T. Colquitt for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Edgar Watkins for the plaintiff in error.

Thomas G. Watkins, Trustee, et al., Petitioners,
248 vs.
J. H. Sedberry et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. C. C. Calhoun for the petitioners, and by Mr. Norman Farrell for the respondents.

Durham Public Service Company, Plaintiff in Error,
251 vs.
The City of Durham.

This cause was argued by Mr. J. S. Manning for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. S. C. Chambers for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock

Monday, January 22nd, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler.
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Garrard Glenn, it is ordered that Harold N. Whitehouse, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Horace T. Jones, it is ordered that John Mock, Esquire, of Bluffton, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas T. Connally, it is ordered that Nathan Patten, Esquire, of Waco, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. A. McLaughlin, it is ordered that Harvey Hoshour, Esquire, of Duluth, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. I. F. Goldenhorn, it is ordered that Saul Nemser, Esquire, of Jersey City, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John E. Hall, it

is ordered that Augustus O. B. Sparks, Esquire, of Macon, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Preston A. Shinn, it is ordered that Jesse J. Worten, Esquire, of Pawhuska, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Frear, it is ordered that Alfred Joseph Buscheck, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh H. Obear, it is ordered that Henry Campbell Miller, Esquire, of Anderson, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
160 vs.
C. W. Lane, Producers Oil Company, The Texas Company, et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The United States of America, Appellant,
161 vs.
The Gulf Refining Company of Louisiana.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The United States of America, Appellant, vs. Southwestern Gas and Electric Company, Caddo Oil and Gas Company, and Gulf Refining Company of Louisiana. — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

162

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The United States of America, Appellant, vs. The Gulf Refining Company of Louisiana. — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

163

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this

cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. A. C. Loucks et al. 191

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The United States of America, Appellant, vs. Charles J. Greene, Jr., Louisiana Oil Refining Company, and Louisiana Oil Refining Corporation. 192

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

J. W. Lee, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company. 422

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the

District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Bankers Trust Company and John McMullen, Executors of the Estate of Lena McMullen, deceased,
Plaintiffs in Error,
169 vs.
William H. Blodgett, Tax Commissioner of the State of Connecticut.

In Error to the Superior Court of the State of Connecticut.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court of the State of Connecticut, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Superior Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Essgee Company of China et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error and Appellants,
706 vs.
The United States of America.
Hanclaire Trading Corporation et al.,
Appellants,
707 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance these causes, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the causes assigned for argument on Monday, April 16th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Max Hart, Appellant,
763 vs.
B. F. Keith Vaudeville Exchange et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 23d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Jesse C. Adkins et al.,
Appellants,
795 vs.
The Children's Hospital of the District of Columbia.
Jesse C. Adkins et al.,
Appellants,
796 vs.
Willis A. Lyons.

On consideration of the motion to advance these causes, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the causes assigned for argument on Monday, February 26th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Albert and J. M. Anderson Manufacturing Company,
Appellant,
740 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, on condition of submission on briefs without oral argument.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Central Coal & Coke Company,
Petitioner,
749 vs.
Jacob Ocepek.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 19th next, on the summary docket, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Taubel-Scott-Kitzmiller Company, Inc., Petitioner,
781 vs.
David J. Fox et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Prestonettes, Inc.,
Petitioner,
793 vs.
Francois Joseph Spoturno Coty.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Endicott et al., Petitioners, — On petition for writ of certiorari
700 vs. — to The Supreme Court of the State of
The Board of Assessors of the City of Detroit et al. — Michigan.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Filene's Sons Company, Petitioner, — On petition for writ of certiorari
733 vs. — to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.
Gilchrist Company.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Nehalem Steamship Company et al., Petitioners, — On petition for writ of certiorari
765 vs. — to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.
Aktieselskabet Aggi et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dolly McCalmont, Administratrix, etc., Petitioner, — On petition for writ of certiorari
773 vs. — to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.
Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the

United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry P. Reed et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Village of Hibbing et al. 319 — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John J. McGrath et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America. 222 — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Peters Trust Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The County of Douglas in the State of Nebraska. 227 — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hattiesburg Grocery Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Stokes V. Robertson, State Revenue Agent of the State of Mississippi. 214

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

ORDER.

Mr. Justice Pitney having resigned, it is ordered that the following allotment be made of the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of this court among the circuits, agreeably to the act of Congress in such case made and provided, and that such allotment be entered of record, viz:

For the First Circuit, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Associate Justice.
For the Second Circuit, Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justice.
For the Third Circuit, Pierce Butler, Associate Justice.
For the Fourth Circuit, William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
For the Fifth Circuit, James C. McReynolds, Associate Justice.
For the Sixth Circuit, James C. McReynolds, Associate Justice.
For the Seventh Circuit, George Sutherland, Associate Justice.
For the Eighth Circuit, Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justice.
For the Ninth Circuit, Joseph McKenna, Associate Justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced that the court will take a recess from Monday, January 29th, until February 19th next.

M. Frank Andrews, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America. 253

The motion to dismiss the writ of error herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, Mr. Solicitor General Beck, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Charles A. Douglas, Mr. Richard A. Ford, and Mr. H. G. Miller for the plaintiff in error in opposition

Thomas D. McCarthy, United States Marshal, Appellant,
404 vs.
Jules W. Arndstein.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the appellant.

Simon Hecht et al., Petitioners,
532 vs.
John F. Malley, Former Collector of Internal Revenue;
Arthur L. Howard et al., Petitioners,
533 vs.
John F. Malley, Former Collector of Internal Revenue;
and
Arthur L. Howard et al., Petitioners,
534 vs.
Andrew J. Casey, Former Acting Collector of Internal Revenue.

The motion to advance these causes was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the respondents.

Alvah Crocker et al., Trustees, Petitioners,
587 vs.
John F. Malley, Collector.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the respondent.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
18, Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

The application of Red River Syndicate claimants under Section 19, Federal leasing act of February 25, 1920, to a portion of the land involved, for leave to file brief seeking clarification of certain language in the opinion of this Court of May 1, 1922, was submitted by Mr. Conrad H. Syme in that behalf.

The Pusey & Jones Company, Petitioner,
431 vs.
Hans Karluf Hanssen.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Otto A. Schlobohm in behalf of counsel for the petitioner.

The John E. Thropp's Sons Company, Petitioner,
774 vs.
Frank A. Seiberling.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Livingston Gifford and Mr. Thomas G. Haight for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert Fletcher Rogers for the respondent.

Samuel D. White, as Trustee, etc., Petitioner,
777 vs.
Veta Stump.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James E. Babb for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harve H. Phipps for the respondent.

S. H. Benjamin Fuel & Supply Company, Petitioner,
778 vs.
Bell Union Coal & Mining Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. F. Bullitt for the petitioner.

Edward J. Donegan, Petitioner,
790 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Elijah N. Zoline for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Gorham Manufacturing Company, Appellant,
196 vs.
James A. Wendell, Individually and as Comptroller of the State of New York, et al.

The return to the rule to show cause herein was argued by Mr. Robert C. Beatty for the appellant.

Joaquin Ramos Ferro et al., Petitioners,
261 vs.
Felix Fabian et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed without costs to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. Ochoa y Hermano,
Petitioner,
262 vs.
Miguel, Luis, Gerardo,
Teresa and Antonio
Martorell y Torrens.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed without costs to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Hunter, Plaintiff in Error,
255 vs.
The Weil Corset Company (Inc.).

This cause was argued by Mr. Elijah N. Zoline for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Benjamin Slade for the defendant in error.

Bluefield Water Works & Improvement Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
256 vs.
Public Service Commission of the State of West Virginia et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Alfred G. Fox for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Russell S. Ritz for the defendants in error.

The Price Fire & Water Proofing Company, Appellant,
257 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. S. S. Ashbaugh for the appellant, and continued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, January 23rd, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler.
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Adam H. Gard, it is ordered that Ralph A. Shepard, Esquire, Henry O. Gartner, Esquire, and Louis K. Sunderlin, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and John H. Donovan, Esquire, of Peabody, State of Massachusetts, Benjamin Kirk Hamilton, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, and Tracy E. Mulligan, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Townsend, it is ordered that Sid A. Erwin, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Addison Taylor Smith, it is ordered that Joseph D. Taylor, Esquire, of Cambridge, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. P. Goldman, it is ordered that William F. Unger, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel Herrick, it is ordered that Payson W. Spaulding, Esquire, of Evanston, State of Wyoming, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court,

and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence F. Burton, it is ordered that Cornelius C. Webster, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway et al., Appellants, 396 vs. The State of Tennessee et al., etc., et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. P. J. Farrell in that behalf.

Hartford Life Insurance Company, Petitioner, 265 vs. Frank F. Douds et al., and Hartford Life Insurance Company, Petitioner, 271 vs. Robert H. Langdale.

These causes were passed pursuant to stipulation of counsel.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error, 407 vs. The United States of America; and The United States of America et al., Plaintiffs in Error, 394 vs. George F. Benedict, Trustee, etc.

The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. Formey Johnston for the plaintiffs in error in No. 407, continued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for The United States, by Mr. R. E. T. Riggs for the defendant in error in No. 394, by Mr. C. J. Mehrbas for the City of New York, and concluded by Mr. R. E. T. Riggs for the defendant in error in No. 394.

United States Grain Corporation, Plaintiff in Error, 290 vs. Wallace B. Phillips.

This cause was argued by Mr. Garrard Glenn for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. H. H. Whitehouse for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, January 24th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler.
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Adam R. Gard, it is ordered that Harry C. Armstrong, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Conrad H. Syme, it is ordered that McKinley W. Kreigh, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earl C. Michener, it is ordered that O. L. Smith, Esquire, of Lansing, and Charles W. Gore, Esquire, of Benton Harbor, State of Michigan, and Frederick J. Smith, Esquire, of Taunton, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

David Lamar, Appellant,
201 vs.
The United States.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Elijah H. Zoline and Mr. Thomas B. Felder for the appellant, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the appellee.

Yuma County Water Users' Association et al., Appellants,
268 vs.
W. W. Schlecht et al.

On motion of Mr. Alfred A. Wheat in that behalf, this cause was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

L. Vogelstein & Company (Inc.), Appellant,
259 vs.
The United States.

On motion of Mr. Alfred A. Wheat in that behalf, this cause was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, etc., Plaintiff in Error,
270 vs.
Farmers' Cooperative Equity Company.

This cause was passed pursuant to stipulation of counsel.

William F. Krell, Plaintiff in Error,
272 vs.
The People of the State of Illinois.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Valley Farms Company of Yonkers, Plaintiff in Error,
136 vs.
County of Westchester.

This cause was argued by Mr. Robert C. Beatty for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. William A. Davidson for the defendant in error.

Charles Keller et al., Appellants,
260 vs.
Potomac Electric Power Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Conrad H. Syme for the appellants.

ORDER: This case is passed for the purpose of having presented and argued to the Court three questions: First, whether Congress can vest in this Court under the restrictions upon its appellate jurisdiction under the Constitution the character of review of the proceedings of the Public Utilities Commission contemplated by the Act creating it, and second, whether an appeal can be taken to this court until

a final judgment has been pronounced in the District Court of Appeals, and, third, whether such judgment is final.

These questions will be set for argument on February 19th next, after the cases specially set for that day, and will be considered and decided by this Court before proceeding to hear the case on its merits in the event that the court finds it has jurisdiction to do so.

Jose J. Benitez Diaz, etc., et al., Petitioners,

263 vs.

Carlota and Clementina Gonzales y Lugo, etc., et al.

Leave was granted counsel in this cause to file an additional brief on each side within one week.

The cause was argued by Mr. C. C. Webster for the petitioners, and by Mr. J. A. Poventud for the respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, January 25th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler. — Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the court in this behalf by Mr. Philip P. Campbell, it is ordered that Mrs. Lou-Ida Martin and Charles I. Martin, Esquire, of Topeka, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John C.Kleczka, it is ordered that W. T. Doar, Esquire, of New Richmond, State of Wisconsin, and David P. Siegel, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles A. Vilas, it is ordered that R. M. J. Armstrong, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Claude A. Swanson, it is ordered that James D. Johnston, Esquire, of Roanoke, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Johanna Frese, Administratrix, etc., Petitioner,
275 vs.
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company.

This cause was continued.

The First National Bank of San Jose, Plaintiff in Error,
276 vs.
The State of California et al.

This cause was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

Wells-Elkhorn Coal Company, Plaintiff in Error,
277 vs.
Otis Steel Company.

This cause was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

Layne & Bowler Corporation, Petitioner,
278 vs.
Western Well Works (Inc.) et al.

This cause was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
284 vs.
Public Service Commission of Missouri.

This cause was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

W. H. Hightower et al., Appellants,
264 vs.
The American National Bank of Macon, Georgia.

This cause was argued by Mr. John E. Hall for the appellants, and by Mr. Orville A. Park for the appellee.

W. T. Campbell, Plaintiff in Error,
266 vs.
The City of Olney.

This cause was passed pursuant to stipulation of counsel.

William Randall et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
274 vs.
The Board of Commissioners of Tippecanoe County, Indiana.

On motion of Mr. Clyde H. Jones in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief for defendant in error in this cause within one week.

The cause was argued by Mr. Otto Gresham for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. Clyde H. Jones for the defendant in error.

Dora E. Rooker et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error.
285 vs.
Fidelity Trust Company et al.

This cause was submitted on motion to dismiss or affirm by Mr. Merrill Moores in behalf of Mr. Charles E. Cox for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. William V. Rooker for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

The Charles Nelson Company,
Appellant,
287 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William E. Humphrey for the appellant, and continued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, January 26th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Elliott, it is ordered that William Campbell McLain, Esquire, and Robert Beverly Herbert, Esquire, of Columbia, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Wharton Pepper, it is ordered that William H. Kirkpatrick, Esquire, of Easton, Clarence D. Coughlin, Esquire, of Wilkes-Barre, and Fred B. Gernerd, Esquire, of Allentown, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Joe Bonner, Appellant,
288 vs.
J. C. Middlebrooks, Sheriff, etc.

This cause was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

American Steel Foundries,
Appellant,
291 vs.
Thomas E. Robertson, Commissioner of Patents, etc.

This cause was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

Frederick Wesche, Appellant,
292 vs.
Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian.

This cause was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

Raton Water Works Company, Appellant,
293 vs.
The City of Raton.

This cause was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

Reuben Cooley, Plaintiff in Error,
294 vs.
The State of Georgia.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

International Life Insurance Company, Plaintiff in Error,
295 vs.
Adrian P. Sherman.

This cause was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

Madera Sugar Pine Company, Plaintiff in Error,
296 vs.
Industrial Commission of California et al.

This cause was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

Albert Hanson Lumber Company, (Limited), Plaintiff in Error,
300 vs.
The United States.

This cause was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

The Charles Nelson Company, Appellant,
287 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. William C. Prentiss for the appellant.

Columbia Railway, Gas & Electric Company, Plaintiff in Error.	On motion of Mr. William Elliott for the plaintiff in error, leave was granted to file additional brief for the plaintiff in error.
297 vs.	
The State of South Carolina.	

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William Elliott for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. Jo-Berry S. Lyles for the plaintiff in error, by Mr. S. M. Wolfe and Mr. J. Fraser Lyon for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Jo-Berry S. Lyles for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, January 29th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler. Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that Howard Wilmurt Ameli, Esquire, of New York City, and Edgar Tremlett Fell, Esquire, of Annapolis, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert Ottinger, it is ordered that J. Henry Walters, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John McDuffie, it is ordered that Joseph H. McAleer, Esquire, of Mobile, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry F. Ashurst, it is ordered that Fred A. Sutter, Esquire, of Bisbee, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Atlee Pomerene, it is ordered that W. H. Annat, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Henry Butler, it is ordered that William H. Van Benschoten, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham, it is ordered that Fred Esch, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John S. Flannery, it is ordered that Caesar L. Aiello, Esquire, and Charles B. Tebbs, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Norman B. Beecher, it is ordered that Meyer Lissner, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Webster Ballinger, it is ordered that John A. Massen, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Green H. Hackworth, it is ordered that John Junell, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Philip P. Campbell, it is ordered that A. W. Thurman, Esquire, of Joplin, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Leigh Ellis & Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. James C. Davis, as Agent, etc. — In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

246

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the

United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

A. Bourjois & Company, Inc., Petitioner,
190 vs.
Anna Katzel.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Olga Gathmann Foley, Administratrix of the Estate of Louis Gathmann, deceased, Appellant,
203 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Henry J. Conley, Plaintiff in Error,

193 vs.

Llewellyn Barton.

In Error to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Maine.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Maine, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Judicial Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

Thomas D. McCarthy, United States Marshal for the Southern District of New York, Appellant,
404 vs.
Jules W. Arndstein.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 9th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Simon Hecht et al., Petitioners,
532 vs.
John F. Malley, Former Collector of Internal Revenue.
Arthur L. Howard et al., Trustees, Petitioners,
533 vs.
John F. Malley, Former Collector of Internal Revenue.
Arthur L. Howard et al., Trustees, Petitioners,
534 vs.
Andrew J. Casey, Former Acting Collector of Internal Revenue.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, March 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alvah Crocker et al., Trustees, Petitioners,
587 vs.
John F. Malley, Collector.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 5th next, after the cases

The Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway et al., Appellants, 396 vs. The State of Tennessee et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 9th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Pusey & Jones Company, Petitioner, 431 vs. Hans Marluf Hansson.

On consideration of the motion to advance, or place this cause on the summary docket, It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, placed on the summary docket and assigned for argument on Monday, February 19th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, 18, Original. vs. The State of Texas, Defendant; The United States of America, Intervenor.

On consideration of the application of the Red River Syndicate, Claimant, for a modification of the opinion delivered in this cause on May 1st, 1922,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said application be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

David Lamar, Appellant, 201 vs. The United States of America.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

M. Frank Andrews, Plaintiff in Error, 255 vs. The United States of America.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the

cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Appellant,
121 vs.
Mason & Hanger Company.

On consideration of the petition for a rehearing of these cases,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted; and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, February 26th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The John E. Thropp's Sons Company,
Petitioner,
774 vs.
Frank A. Seiberling.

On petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel D. White, as Trustee, etc.,
Petitioner,
777 vs.
Veta Stump.

On petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

S. H. Benjamin Fuel & Supply Company,
Petitioner,
778 vs.
Bell Union Coal & Mining Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that

the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward J. Donegan, Petitioner,
790 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Domingo Diaz A., et al.,
Appellants,
572 vs.
Guillermo Patterson.

The motion to dismiss or affirm herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. J. Schwarz and Mr. Edwin T. Merrick for the appellee in support of the motion.

Jesse C. Adkins et al.,
Appellants,
795 vs.
The Children's Hospital of the District of Columbia;
and
Jesse C. Adkins et al.,
Appellants,
796 vs.
Willis A. Lyons.

The motion for leave to file brief herein as amici curiae and to take part in the oral argument, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. H. Stephens in behalf of the Attorneys General of Wisconsin, Oregon and California.

L. E. Smith Glass Company,
Petitioner,
808 vs.
Macbeth-Evans Glass Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William O. Belt and Mr. Arthur O. Fording for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederick W. Winter and Mr. Edward Rector for the respondent.

American Trust Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
716 vs.
S. S. McNinch et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John M. Robinson for the petitioner and by Mr. William P. Bynum, Mr. W. Cleveland Davis, Mr. Plummer Stewart, Mr. John A. McRae, and Mr. John J. Parker for the respondents.

C. Dale Wolfe, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of
C. F. Killingsworth, a bankrupt, Petitioner,

762 vs. The petition for a writ of certiorari
G. F. Killingsworth et al. herein was submitted to the consideration
of the Court by Mr. C. Dale Wolfe for the petitioner.

J. C. Turner Lumber Company et al., The petition for a writ of certiorari
Petitioners, herein was submitted to the consideration
789 vs. of the Court by Mr. Samuel Silbiger for
Wilson & Bennett et al. the petitioners and by Mr. Max Isaac for
the respondents.

Closter National Bank, Plaintiff The petition for a writ of certiorari
in Error, herein was submitted to the consideration
797 vs. of the Court by Mr. Edmund W. Wakelee for
Federal Reserve Bank of New York. the plaintiff in error in support of the
petition and by Mr. L. H. Mason for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

The Central Railroad Company of The petition for a writ of certiorari
New Jersey, Petitioner, herein was submitted to the consideration
806 vs. of the Court by Mr. Charles E. Miller for the
Anita Peluso, Administratrix, etc. petitioner, and by Mr. Sidney A. Syme for
the respondent in opposition thereto.

American Railway Express Company The petition for a writ of certiorari
et al., Petitioners, herein was submitted to the consideration
817 vs. of the Court by Mr. Charles W. Stockton
M. F. Brabham. and Mr. K. E. Stockton for the petitioners.

Robert J. McBride, Petitioner, The petition for a writ of certiorari
818 vs. herein was submitted to the consideration
The United States. of the Court by Mr. Harry T. Smith and Mr.
Joseph M. McAleer for the petitioner, with leave to counsel for the respondent
to file brief in opposition to the petition within five days.

Washington Terminal Company, In Error to the Court of Appeals of the
Plaintiff in Error, District of Columbia.
234 vs.
Emma G. Callahan, Administratrix, etc.
etc. It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in
error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Proclamation being made the court is adjourned until Monday, February 19, 1925, at 12 o'clock.

Monday, February 19th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

Willis Van Devanter,

James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.

Louis D. Brandeis,

George Sutherland,

Pierce Butler,

Edward T. Sanford.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that Edward K. Hanlon, Esquire, George P. Nicholson, Esquire, and Eugene Fay, Esquire, of New York City; Justus Chancellor, Esquire, Bernhardt Frank, Esquire, and Gerald G. Barry, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois; Clarence A. Miller, Esquire, and J. Wallace Nichol, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; Bradley Walker, Esquire, Harry A. Luck, Esquire, Jay C. Stephenson, Esquire, Jordan Stokes, Esquire, and William C. Cheney, Esquire, of Nashville, State of Tennessee; and Mrs. Ann Severance Hartman, of Crosby, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl R. Chindblom, it is ordered that Albert H. Fry, Esquire, of Fremont, State of Ohio, and Harry F. Chaveriat, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ashley Cockrill, it is ordered that E. J. Dimock, Esquire, of New York City, W. B. Smith, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, and John S. Weller, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J.

admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Clinton, it is ordered that Ulysses S. Thomas, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dale D. Drain, it is ordered that Mason Wheeler, Esquire, of Lincoln, and O. S. Spillman, Esquire, of Pierce, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur F. Mullen, it is ordered that Charles E. Sandall, Esquire, of York, and Otto William Meier, Esquire, of Lincoln, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John N. Torvestad, it is ordered that George Edgar Johnson, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph A. Burkhart, it is ordered that Robert L. Russell, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham, it is ordered that Henry J. Balzer, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Henry Butler, it is ordered that James C. Sweeney, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Challen B. Ellis, it is ordered that Woodson P. Houghton, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Daniel T.Wright, it is ordered that Charles D. Francis, Esquire, of New York City, and Lewis K. Torbet, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Helmus, it is ordered that Maurice Goodman, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Streeter B. Flynn, it is ordered that Edgar S. Ratliff, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Lewis Smith, it is ordered that Godfrey L. Munter, Esquire, and Glenn H. Leland, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Antonio P. Entenza, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Townsend, it is ordered that Wesley L. Hutten, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David A. Richardson, it is ordered that Tom C. Waldrop, Esquire, of Shawnee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Graham, it is ordered that Timothy J. Sullivan, Esquire, of Springfield, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. Riter, it is ordered that Randolph S. Collins, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, and LeRoy L. Hight, Esquire, of Portland, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. B. Renehan, it is ordered that Hugh B. Woodward, Esquire, of Clayton, State of New Mexico, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice said:

"Since the last meeting of the Court, the President has nominated, and the Senate has confirmed, Mr. Edward Terry Sanford to be an associate Justice of this court to succeed to the vacancy created by the retirement of Mr. Justice Pitney. Mr. Sanford is in the court in attendance, and will take the oath. The Clerk will read the commission."

The Clerk then read the commission, and immediately thereafter the oath of office was administered by Mr. Chief Justice Taft, and Mr. Justice Sanford was conducted to his seat on the bench by the Marshal.

Which said commission and oath are in the following words and figures, viz:

"WARREN G. HARDING,

President of the United States of America,

To all who shall see these presents Greeting:

KNOW YE, That reposing special trust and confidence in the Wisdom, Uprightness, and Learning of Edward T. Sanford, of Tennessee, I have nominated and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, do appoint him to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, and do authorize and empower him to execute and fulfil the duties of that office according to the Constitution and Laws of the said United States, and to Have and to Hold the said office, with all the powers, privileges and emoluments to the same of right appertaining unto him, the said Edward T. Sanford, during his good behavior.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have caused these Letters to be made patent and the Seal of the Department of Justice to be hereunto affixed.

Given under my hand, in the District of Columbia, the 29th day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and twenty-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-seventh.

(SEAL).

(Signed) WARREN G. HARDING.

By the President:
(Signed) JAMES M. BECK,
Acting Attorney General."

OATH OF OFFICE FOR UNITED STATES JUDGES.

(Sections 712 and 1757, Revised Statutes.)

I, EDWARD T. SANFORD, do solemnly swear that I will administer justice without respect to persons, and do equal right to the poor and to the rich, and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all the duties incumbent on me as Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, according to the best of my abilities and understanding, agreeably to the Constitution and laws of the United States; and that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. SO HELP ME GOD.

(Signed) Edward T. Sanford.

Subscribed and sworn to before me, this nineteenth day of February, 1923.

(Signed) Wm. H. Taft,
Chief Justice of the United States."

The United States of America, Complainant,
25, Original. vs.
The State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the bill of complaint and the motion to dismiss the same, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the bill of complaint herein be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The Western & Atlantic Railroad, Appellant,
195 vs.
The Railroad Commission of Georgia et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and

the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

City of Paducah, Frederick W. Matterjohn, Mayor; William V. Eaton, Commissioner of Public Safety, et al., Appellants,
243 vs.
Paducah Railway Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, modified in accordance with the opinion of this Court, and, as so modified, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The United States of America
202 vs.
Bhagat Singh Thind.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the first question certified must be answered in the negative; and that the second question certified need not be answered.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Louis Brownlow, Charles W. Kutz, Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and John P. Healy, Inspector of Buildings of the District of Columbia, Plaintiffs in Error,
95 vs.
Mollie Schwartz.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Fred W. Cramer, Ira B. Cramer, and Central Pacific Railway Company, Appellants, vs. The United States of America. 207

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Columbia Railway, Gas and Electric Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of South Carolina. 297

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

William Randall and George S. Akers, Plaintiffs in Error, 274 vs. The Board of Commissioners of Tippecanoe County, Indiana. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Malcolm Douglas and Bert C. Ross, Prosecuting Attorney and Deputy Prosecuting Attorney for King County, Appellants, 159 vs. Leon Noble. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Bank of America, Plaintiff in Error, 205 vs. Whitney Central National Bank. — In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Samuel Lumiere, Appellant,
242 vs.
Mae Edna Wilder, Inc.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Price Fire & Water Proofing Company,
Appellant,
257 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Akron, Canton and Youngstown Railway Company, The Ann Arbor Railroad Company, et al., Appellants,
646 vs.
The United States of America, The Interstate Commerce Commission, Boston & Maine Railroad Company, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Kansas City Southern Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
194 vs.
Harry B. Wolf, Charles M. Blackmar, and Henry A. Bundschie.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Minnesota Commercial Men's Association, Petitioner,
103 vs.
Minnie Mae Benn, as Executrix of the Estate of Robert J. Benn, deceased.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Opinion by Mr. Justice McReynolds.

United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, Petitioner,
93 vs.
John E. Sullivan.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel

thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, Plaintiff in Error, vs. John E. Sullivan. 124

In Error to the Superior Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Durham Public Service Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of Durham. 251

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The Valley Farms Company of Yonkers, Plaintiff in Error, vs. County of Westchester. 136

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dora E. Hooker and William V. Hooker, Plaintiffs in Error,
285 vs.
Fidelity Trust Company and Fidelity Trust Company, as Trustee of the Estate of Dora E. Hooker.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Great Northern Railway Company, Petitioner,
152 vs.
Vivian H. Steinke, Paul E. Steinke, Springbrook State Bank, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Frank Moore, Ed. Hicks, J. E. Knox, et al., Appellants,
199 vs.
E. H. Dempsey, Keeper of the Arkansas State Penitentiary.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be,

and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds,
Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Jose J. Benitez Diaz, in his own right and as father with Patria Potestas, etc., et al., Petitioners,

263 vs.

Carlota and Clementina Gonzalez y Lugo, represented by their Guardian ad litem, Arturo Aponte, Jr., et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that the decree of the Supreme Court of Porto Rico in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

United States Grain Corporation, Plaintiff in Error,

290 vs.

Wallace B. Phillips.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals,

in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Gorham Manufacturing Company, Appellant,
196 vs.
James A. Wendell, Individually and as Comptroller of the State of New York, et al.

On consideration of the motion to substitute The Tax Commission of the State of New York and Carl Sherman, Individually and as Attorney General of the State of New York, as the parties appellees herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George E. Vandenburgh, Petitioner,
273 vs.
Truscon Steel Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Concrete Steel Company, Petitioner,
238 vs.
George E. Vandenburgh.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of

Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York with directions to dismiss the bill.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Charles Nelson Company,
Appellant,
287 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Crown Die and Tool Company,
Petitioner,
240 vs.
Nye Tool and Machine Works.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Eibel Process Company,
Petitioner,
178 vs.
Minnesota & Ontario Paper Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the

United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, dismissing the bill, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the District of Maine, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Appellant,
585 vs.
United States Railroad Labor Board et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the court:

The State of North Dakota, Complainant,
11, Original. vs.
The State of Minnesota.

It is ordered by this Court that this case be reassigned for argument on Monday, March 12th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Domingo, Diaz A., et al., Appellants,
572 vs.
Guillermo Patterson.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jesse C. Adkins et al., etc.,
Appellants,
795 vs.
The Children's Hospital of the
District of Columbia.

On consideration of the motions on behalf of the Attorneys General of several States for leave to file briefs and participate in the oral argument of these cases as amici curiae,

Jesse C. Adkins et al., etc.,
Appellants,
796 vs.
Willie A. Lyons.

It is ordered that the motions be, and the same are hereby, granted as to the filing of briefs; and that one representative be selected to represent all the States and permitted one hour for oral argument.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Emanuel Wallin, Petitioner,
751 vs.
Rose Everett.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. Dale Wolfe, Trustee, etc.,
Petitioner,
762 vs.
C. F. Killingsworth et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to The Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. C. Turner Lumber Company
et al., Petitioners,
789 vs.
Wilson & Bennett et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Closter National Bank, Plaintiff in Error,
797 vs.
Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Central Railroad Company of New Jersey, Petitioner,
806 vs.
Anita Peluso, Administratrix, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

L. E. Smith Glass Company, Petitioner,
808 vs.
Macbeth-Evans Glass Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Railway Express Company et al., Petitioners,
817 vs.
M. F. Brabham.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Robert J. McBride, Petitioner, vs. The United States. 818

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

McLane Tilton, Appellant, vs. Felix M. Drennen, as Receiver, etc. 87

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause having been reported to the Court by the Clerk, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Porto Rico Coal Company, Inc., Plaintiff in Error, vs. William H. Edwards, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc. 233

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause having been reported to the Court by the Clerk, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Judson Knox, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America. 252

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of South Carolina.

This cause having been reported to the Court by the Clerk, and it

appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Roy Youman, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Commonwealth of Kentucky. — In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

395

This cause having been reported to the Court by the Clerk, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank J. Levene, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Alabama. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

491

This cause having been reported to the Court by the Clerk, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth Rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jay Burns Baking Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Samuel R. McKelvie, as Governor, etc., et al. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

522

This cause having been reported to the Court by the Clerk, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank Dillon, Plaintiff in Error, In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

537 vs.

The People of the State of Illinois.

This cause having been reported to the Court by the Clerk, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Stefano Sanguinetti, Appellant, Appeal from the Court of Claims.

634 vs.

The United States.

This cause having been reported to the Court by the Clerk, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel. Catoni Tisi, alias Lista Cortina, Appellant, Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

640 vs.

Robert E. Tod, Commissioner of Immigration, etc.

This cause having been reported to the Court by the Clerk, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Puget Sound Power & Light Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,

653 vs.
The County of King et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause having been reported to the Court by the Clerk, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John H. Erede, Appellant,
389 vs.
James M. Powers, United States Marshal;

Mary Partridge, Plaintiff in Error,
410 vs.
J. E. Crosbie et al.;
Samuel Homer Woodbridge et al., Executors, etc., Appellants,
418 vs.
The United States; and
The State of Arkansas ex rel. Jefferson Black, Plaintiff in Error,
651 vs.
Board of Directors of School District 16, Montgomery County, Arkansas.

It is ordered by the Court that these cases will severally stand dismissed under the 10th rule unless the deposit for printing the record is made on or before March 5th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Eaton Water Works Company, Appellant,
293 vs.
The City of Eaton.

It is ordered by the Court that this case will stand dismissed under the 10th rule unless the deposit for printing the record is made on or before May 1st next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

ORDER.

It is ordered that the following allotment be made of the Chief Justice

and Associate Justices of this Court among the Circuits agreeably to the Act of Congress in such case made and provided, and that such allotment be entered of record, viz:

For the First Circuit, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Associate Justice.
For the Second Circuit, Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justice.
For the Third Circuit, Pierce Butler, Associate Justice.
For the Fourth Circuit, William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
For the Fifth Circuit, Edward T. Sanford, Associate Justice.
For the Sixth Circuit, James C. McReynolds, Associate Justice.
For the Seventh Circuit, George Sutherland, Associate Justice.
For the Eighth Circuit, Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justice.
For the Ninth Circuit, Joseph McKenna, Associate Justice.

The Chief Justice also announced that the court will adjourn on Wednesday, the 21st instant, until Friday, the 23d instant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, February 20th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford.
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Carroll Todd, it is ordered that Fred L. Williams, Esquire, of Houston, and Frank Feuille, Jr., Esquire, of Austin, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ira J. Underwood, it is ordered that Arthur S. Roberts, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ottamar Hamele, it is ordered that Joseph H. Beardslee, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. Rogers, it is ordered that William J. Carroll, Esquire, of Lowell, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Selden P. Spencer, it is ordered that Christy M. Farrar, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stanley B. Houck, it is ordered that Walter H. Newton, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank B. Kellogg, it is ordered that Christian Rosenmeier, Esquire, of Little Falls, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard P. Ernst, it is ordered that Charles P. Ogden, Esquire, and Edward Bloomfield, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Harry T. Graham, Individually, etc., et al., Petitioners,
846 vs.
Alfred I. DuPont.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioners.

Norfolk Southern Railroad Company, Petitioner,
842 vs.
Thomas V. Gordon.

The motion for a supersedeas herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert N. Simms and Mr. C. M. Bain for the petitioner.

Timothy D. Murphy, Petitioner,
838 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion for a supersedeas herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James J. Barbour, Mr. Charles P. Epstein, Mr. Lawrence Y. Sherman, and Mr. Noah C. Bainum for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Jesse C. Adkins et al., etc., Appellants,
795 vs.
The Children's Hospital of the District of Columbia; and
Jesse C. Adkins et al., etc., Appellants,
796 vs.

On motion of Mr. Edwin P. Griffin in behalf of the State of New York, leave was granted to file brief herein as amicus curiae.

Standard Oil Company of New York, Petitioner,
831 vs.
Clyde Steamship Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Rufus S. Day and Mr. P. M. Brown for the petitioner, and by Mr. Chauncey I. Clark for the respondent.

Utah Consolidated Mining Company, Petitioner,
847 vs.
Utah Apex Mining Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William D. Riter in behalf of Mr. John P. Gray and Mr. A. C. Ellis, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. A. Marshall and Mr. W. E. Colby for the respondent.

Mary L. Milheim et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
791 vs.
The Moffat Tunnel Improvement District.

The motion to dismiss or affirm was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horton Montgomery for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Edwin H. Park and Mr. Barnwell S. Stuart for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

David H. Riddle, Appellant,
663 vs.
James E. Dyche, Warden, etc.

The motion to admit appellant to bail or in the alternative, to advance, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry E. Davis for the appellant.

Sergius Apostoloff, Appellant,
--- vs.
Conrad Hubert et al.

The motion to docket this cause and for leave to proceed in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry E. Davis for the appellant.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Complainant,
20, Original. vs.
The State of New York et al.

On motion of Mr. Frederic D. McKenney in that behalf, leave was granted to file answer of defendant McIntyre in this case.

Sam Winokur, Plaintiff in Error,
244 vs.
H. I. Harn, Sheriff, etc.

The motion to reinstate this cause and to assign it for argument was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney in that behalf.

John W. Talbot, Petitioner,

856 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion for supersedeas herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney in that behalf.

Ward Grandpre, Petitioner,
799 vs.
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Woodson P. Houghton in behalf of Mr. Tom Davis, Mr. Ernest A. Michel, and Mr. Wade H. Ellis for the petitioner, and by Mr. O. W. Dynes for the respondent.

Robert T. Meyer,
Plaintiff in Error,
325 vs.
The State of Nebraska;
and
Nebraska District of Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio and other States, et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
440 vs.
Samuel R. McKelvie et al., etc.

On motion of Mr. Bernard Hershkoff in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief herein as amici curiae.

Prestonettes (Inc.),
Petitioner,
793 vs.
Francois Joseph de Spoturno Coty.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. A. Wheat in that behalf.

Taubel-Scott-Kitzmiller Company (Inc.), Petitioner,
781 vs.
David J. Fox et al., Trustees, etc.

The motion to vacate writ of certiorari, or to advance, was submitted by Mr. A. A. Wheat in behalf of counsel for the respondents.

The Baltimore & Ohio Southwestern Railroad Company, Petitioner,

577 vs.
Guerney O. Burtch.

On motion of Mr. A. A. Wheat in that behalf, Lula Burtch, executrix of the estate of Guerney O. Burtch, deceased, was substituted as the party respondent herein.

James C. Davis, as Agent, etc., Petitioner,
468 vs.
Lee A. Wolfe.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sidney Thorne Able and Mr. Charles P. Noell for the respondent.

Oklahoma Gas & Electric Company et al., Appellants,
419 vs.
Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, et al.

On motion of Mr. Streeter B. Flynn in that behalf, Frank C. Carter and Joe Cobb, present members of the Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, were substituted as parties appellees herein.

American Trust Company, Plaintiff in Error,
716 vs.
S. S. McNinch et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander W. Smith in behalf of Mr. William P. Hymm and Mr. W. Cleveland Davis for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. John M. Robinson for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Ex parte In the matter of France & Canada Steamship Corporation, Petitioner.
--- Original.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Culbert Palmer and Mr. Carroll C. Walter for the petitioner.

Henry F. Mueller et al., etc., Appellants,
376 vs.
Samuel W. Adler et al.

The petition for rehearing, or, in the alternative, motion to remand to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Otto A. Schlobohm in that behalf.

Oklahoma Natural Gas Company, Appellant,
406 vs.
Campbell Russell et al., etc., et al.

On motion of Mr. D. A. Richardson in that behalf, Frank C. Carter and Joe Cobb, present members of the Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, were substituted as parties appellees

Board of Trade of the City of Chicago et al., Appellants,
701 vs.
Charles F. Clyne, United States District Attorney, etc., et al.

On motion of Mr. Henry S. Robbins in that behalf, Edwin A. Olsen, present United States District Attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, was substituted as a party appellee herein in place of Charles F. Clyne, resigned.

Tidal Oil Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
764 vs.
J. P. Flanagan.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Preston C. West, Mr. A. A. Davidson, Mr. Wallace C. Franklin, and Mr. Arthur J. Biddison for the plaintiffs in error in support of the petition, and by Mr. Edward H. Chandler and Mr. William O. Beall for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

Sophia Charles et al., Petitioners,
776 vs.
Roxana Petroleum Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert F. Blair and Mr. George S. Ramsey for the petitioners.

J. E. Barrack et al., Petitioners,
798 vs.
Town of Fairbanks, Alaska.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John E. Alexander for the petitioner, and by Mr. Alfred Sutro, Mr. E. S. Pillsbury, Mr. Frank D. Madison, Mr. H. D. Pillsbury, and Mr. Oscar Sutro for the respondent.

The Robert Dollar Company, Petitioner,
803 vs.
American Asiatic Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ira S. Lillick and Mr. Farnham P. Griffiths for the petitioner, and by Mr. R. M. Fitzgerald for the respondent.

E. I. Horsman et al., Petitioners,
807 vs.
Alfred A. Kaufman et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. O. Ellery Edwards for the petitioner.

France and Canada Steamship Corporation, Petitioner,

811 vs.
French Republic.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Carroll G. Walter and Mr. J. Gilbert Palmer for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. H. McGrann for the respondent.

W. Everett et al., Petitioners,
812 vs.
The United States of America et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Otto A. Schlobohm in behalf of Mr. William H. Gorham and Mr. James Kiefer for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Ottinger, and Mr. J. Frank Staley for the respondents.

Director General of Railroads,
Petitioner,
813 vs.
Thomas Keenan.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Daniel M. Beach for the petitioner, and by Mr. Joseph A. Wechter for the respondent.

Great Northern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
820 vs.
McCaull-Dinsmore Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. G. Dorety for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederick M.Miner for the respondent.

Benjamin Kalmanson, Petitioner,
822 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Max D. Steuer for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Farmers and Merchants Bank of Monroe, North Carolina, et al.,
Petitioners,
823 vs.
Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond, Virginia.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alex. W. Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. M. C. Wallace, Mr. H. W. Anderson, and Mr. H. G. Connor, Jr., for respondent.

William Locking, Appellant,
826 vs.
Detroit & Cleveland Navigation Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Locking for the appellant, and by Mr. Henry I. Armstrong for the appellee.

Frank N. Snell et al., Petitioners,
830 vs.
J. C. Turner Lumber Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick Seymour and Mr. William M. Toomer for the petitioner, and by Mr. Samuel Silbiger for the respondent.

Aluminum Company of America, Petitioner,
834 vs.
Federal Trade Commission.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George W. Wickersham and Mr. George E. Gordon for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. W. H. Fuller for respondent.

Lottie I. Kern, Administratrix, etc., Petitioner,
835 vs.
John Barton Payne, Director General of Railroads, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick M. Miner for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. H. Field for the respondent.

Timothy D. Murphy, Petitioner,
838 vs.
The United States of America;
Vincenzo Cosmano, Petitioner,
839 vs.
The United States of America;
and
Edward C. Gierum, Petitioner,
840 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for writs of certiorari in these causes was submitted to the consideration of the court by Mr. James J. Barbour, Mr. Benjamin P. Epstein, Mr. Lawrence Y. Sherman, and Mr. Noah C. Bainum for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

W. W. Smith et al., Petitioners,
848 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John H. Atwood, Mr. James M. Johnson, and Mr. Donald W. Johnson for the petitioners.

The National Bank of Commerce of St. Louis, Petitioner,
650 vs.
David R. Francis et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George L. Edwards, Jr., and Mr. Edward J. White for the petitioner, and by Mr. P. Taylor Bryan, Mr. Sam B. Jeffries, and Mr. Thomas Bond for the respondents.

Wells-Elkhorn Coal Company, Plaintiff in Error,
277 vs.
Otis Steel Company.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

South Utah Mines and Smelters, Plaintiff in Error,
321 vs.
Beaver County.

The motion to dismiss or affirm herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William A. Hilton and Mr. Harvey H. Cluff for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. E. O. Leatherwood and Mr. C. C. Parsons for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Central Coal & Coke Company, Petitioner,
749 vs.
Jacob Ocepek.

This case was submitted by Mr. L. C. Boyle for the petitioner. No brief was filed for the respondent.

Oklahoma Gas & Electric Company et al., Appellants,
419 vs.
Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. R. M. Rainey for the appellants, continued by Mr. E. S. Ratliff for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. S. B. Flynn for the appellants.

Oklahoma Natural Gas Company, Appellant,
406 vs.
Campbell Russell et al., etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. D. A. Richardson for the appellant, and continued by Mr. Henry C. Snyder for the appellees.

Wednesday, February 21st, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward F. Colladay, it is ordered that Martin Saxe, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph T. Robinson, it is ordered that Joseph W. Jamison, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chester A. Bennett, it is ordered that Bertram O. Becker, Esquire, of Ashland, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. A. Hostetler, it is ordered that Frederick H. Hayn, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. A. Hostetler, it is ordered that Joseph Dugan, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Price Fire & Water Proofing Company, Appellant,
257 vs.
The United States.

On motion of Mr. S. S. Ashbaugh for the appellant, the mandate in this cause was granted.

Oklahoma Natural Gas Company, Appellant,
406 vs.
Campbell Russell et al., etc.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. D. A. Richardson for the appellant.

Arkansas Natural Gas Company, Appellant,
500 vs.
Arkansas Railroad Commission et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. W. B. Smith for the appellant, continued by Mr. E. J. Dimock and Mr. Ashley Cockrill for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. W. B. Smith for the appellant.

William A. Prendergast et al., etc., Appellants,
542 vs.
New York Telephone Company.

On motion of Mr. W. W. Chambers in that behalf, Carl Sherman, present Attorney General of New York, was substituted as a party appellant herein, in place of Charles D. Newton, former Attorney General of New York.

The argument of the cause was commenced by Mr. Simon Fleischmann for the appellants, continued by Mr. John W. Davis for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. W. W. Chambers for the appellant.

The City of New York, Appellant,
588 vs.
New York Telephone Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. M. Maldwin Fertig for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Friday next at 12 o'clock.

Friday, February 23rd, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

Willis Van Devanter,

James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.

Louis D. Brandeis,

George Sutherland,

Pierce Butler,

Edward T. Sanford.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward J. White, it is ordered that J. P. McBaine, Esquire, of Columbia, and Fred L. Williams, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis R. Bick, it is ordered that Fred Francis Weiss, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sidney C. Roach, it is ordered that Frank E. Atwood, Esquire, of Carrollton, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter H. Newton, it is ordered that Frederick H. Stinchfield, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry F. Ashurst, it is ordered that John L. Gust, Esquire, of Phoenix, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry Craig Jones, it is ordered that Harley H. Stipp, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert P. Reeder, it is ordered that Charles K. Burdick, Esquire, of Ithaca, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. M. Maldwin Fertig, it is ordered that John Lehman, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles C. Kearns, it is ordered that Albert H. Bell, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, and C. Ellis Moore, Esquire, of Cambridge, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Roland R. Pothier, Appellant,
---
vs.
William R. Rodman, United States Marshal.

The motion for leave to docket this cause and proceed in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Davis G. Arnold for the appellant.

Jesse C. Adkins et al., etc., Appellants,
795
vs.
The Children's Hospital of the District of Columbia; and
Jesse C. Adkins et al., etc., Appellants,
796
vs.
Willie A. Lyons.

The motion to reassign these causes was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. B. Ellis in that behalf.

The City of New York, Appellant,
588
vs.
New York Telephone Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. M. Maldwin Fertig for the appellant, continued by Mr. John W. Davis for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. M. Maldwin Fertig for the appellant.

The United States, Appellant,
510 vs.
Nelson W. Rider.

This cause was argued by Mr. James A. Fowler for the appellant, and by Mr. Henry W. Driscoll for the appellee.

Robert T. Meyer, Plaintiff in Error,
325 vs.
The State of Nebraska; and Nebraska District of Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, etc., et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
440 vs.
Samuel R. McKelvie et al., etc.

The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. A. F. Mullen for the plaintiff in error in No. 440, continued by Mr. Mason Wheeler and Mr. C. S. Spillman for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. C. E. Sandall for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, February 26th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford.
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that Clarence M. Botts, Esquire, of Santa Fe, State of New Mexico, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas G. Bradley, it is ordered that Walter John King, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis H. Stephens, it is ordered that William L. Brewster, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry G. Miller, it is ordered that David E. Keefe, Esquire, and Samuel W. Baxter, Esquire, of East St. Louis, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U.Fletcher, it is ordered that Martin H. Long, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Walsh, it is ordered that Charles H. Studin, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Challen B. Ellis, it is ordered that Nelson Thomas, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Leon B. Lamfrom, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Atlee Pomerene, it is ordered that Alfred Mack, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas J.Walsh, it is ordered that Wayne Johnson, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Neale, it is ordered that Adrian C. Humphreys, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David P. Wolhaupter, it is ordered that Charles C. Montgomery, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Patrick H. Kelley, it is ordered that Albert E. Sherman, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sanford H. E. Freund, it is ordered that Stephen Barker, Esquire, and Wirt Howe, Esquire, of New York City; Bolitha J. Laws, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Ralph H. Hallett, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn

accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh H. Obear, it is ordered that Millidge L. Bonham, Esquire, of Anderson, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Phil D. Swing, it is ordered that Adolphus E. Graupner, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Cleveland A. Newton, it is ordered that Oliver J. Miller, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas Sterling, it is ordered that Max Roehl, Esquire, of Huron, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John H. Carroll, it is ordered that Reuben J. Hagman, Esquire, of Spokane, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. Wallace Dempsey, it is ordered that John Q. Tilson, Esquire, of New Haven, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Bayard T. Hainer, it is ordered that M. C. Garber, Esquire, of Enid, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Charles Hunter, Plaintiff in Error,
256 vs.
The Weil Corset Company, Inc.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Connecticut.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the

District Court of the United States for the District of Connecticut, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions to dismiss the action.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, as Agent under Section 206 of Transportation Act of 1920, etc., Petitioner,
228 vs.
L. N. Dantzler Lumber Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the court:

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania,
Complainant,
16, Orig'l. vs.
The State of West Virginia.

The State of Ohio,
Complainant,
16, Orig'l. vs.
The State of West Virginia.
The United States, Petitioner,
76 vs.

U. S. Webb, Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants,
267 vs.
J. J. O'Brien et al.

W. I. Porterfield et al., Appellants,
299 vs.
U. S. Webb, as Attorney General, etc.

Frank Terrace et al., etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
302 vs.
Lindsay L. Thompson, Attorney General, etc.

Raymond L. Frick et al., Appellants,
555 vs.
U. S. Webb, as Attorney General, etc., et al.

It is now here ordered by the Court that these cases be assigned for argument at the head of the call for Monday, April 16th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Benjamin Gitlow, Plaintiff in Error,
770 vs.
The People of the State of New York.

It is ordered by this Court that this cause be reassigned for argument on Monday, April 9th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jesse C. Adkins et al., etc., Appellants,
795 vs.
The Children's Hospital of the District of Columbia.

Jesse C. Adkins et al., etc., Appellants,
796 vs.
Willie A. Lyons.

It is ordered by this Court that these cases be reassigned for argument on Monday, March 12th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Norfolk Southern Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Thomas V. Gordon. 848

On consideration of the motion for a stay herein pending the consideration of the application for a writ of certiorari,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Timothy D. Murphy, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 858

On consideration of the motion for a stay herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

David H. Riddle, Appellant, vs. James E. Dyche, Warden, etc. 663

On consideration of the motions to admit to bail or to advance herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied as to bail; but that the case be, and the same is hereby, advanced for argument on the summary docket and assigned for Monday, April 9th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sergius Apostoloff, Appellant, vs. Conrad Hubert et al. ---

On consideration of the motion to docket this cause, and for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sam Winokur, Plaintiff in Error, vs. H. I. Harn, Sheriff, etc. 244

On consideration of the motion to reinstate this cause on the docket,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John W. Talbot, Petitioner, vs. The United States. 866

On consideration of the motion for a stay pending the consideration by this Court of the application for a writ of certiorari herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Taubel-Scott-Kitzmiller Company, Inc., Petitioner,
761 vs.
David J. Fox et al., Trustees, etc.

On consideration of the motion to vacate the writ of certiorari granted herein, or to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of France & Canada Steamship Corporation, Petitioner.
--- Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry F. Mueller et al., etc., Appellants,
376 vs.
Samuel W. Adler et al.

On consideration of the petition for a rehearing or to transfer this cause to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said cause be, and the same is hereby, transferred to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, pursuant to the Act of Congress of September 14, 1922.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Prestonettes, Inc., Petitioner,
793 vs.
Francois Joseph de Spotarno Coty.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, as Agent, etc., Petitioner,
468 vs.
Lee A. Wolfe.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

South Utah Mines & Smelters, Plaintiff in Error,
321 vs.
Beaver County.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Great Northern Railway Company, Petitioner,
820 vs.
McCaull-Dinsmore Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to The Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Farmers and Merchants Bank of Monroe, North Carolina, et al., Petitioners,
825 vs.
Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond, Virginia.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry T. Graham, Individually, etc., Petitioner,
846 vs.
Alfred I. DuPont.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wagner Electric Manufacturing Company, Appellant,
738 vs.
Lemar Lyndon et al., etc.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sophia Charles et al., etc., Petitioners, vs. Roxana Petroleum Corporation. 776 — On petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. E. Barrack et al., Petitioners, vs. Town of Fairbanks, Alaska. 798 — On petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Robert Dollar Company, Petitioner, vs. American Asiatic Company. 803 — On petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. I. Horsman et al., etc., Petitioners, vs. Alfred A. Kaufman, et al. 807 — On petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

France and Canada Steamship Corporation, Petitioner,
811 vs.
French Republic.

On petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. Everett et al.,
Petitioners,
812 vs.
The United States, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Director General of Railroads,
Petitioner,
813 vs.
Thomas Keenan.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Benjamin Kalmanson,
Petitioner,
822 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank H. Snell et al., Petitioners,
828 vs.
J. C. Turner Lumber Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Standard Oil Company of New York, Petitioner,
831 vs.
Clyde Steamship Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Aluminum Company of America, Petitioner,
834 vs.
Federal Trade Commission.

On petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lottie I. Kern, Administratrix, etc., Petitioner,
836 vs.
John Barton Payne, Director General, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to The Supreme Court of the State of Montana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Timothy D. Murphy, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to the
838 vs. United States Circuit Court of Appeals for
The United States of America. the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Vincenzo Commano, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to The
839 vs. United States Circuit Court of Appeals for
The United States of America. the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward C. Gierum, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to The
840 vs. United States Circuit Court of Appeals for
The United States of America. the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Utah Consolidated Mining Company, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to The
847 vs. United States Circuit Court of Appeals for
Utah Apex Mining Company. the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. V. Smith et al., Petitioners, On petition for writ of certiorari to The
848 vs. United States Circuit Court of Appeals for

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The National Bank of Commerce of St. Louis, Petitioner,
850 vs.
David R. Francis et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to The Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Central Coal & Coke Company, Petitioner,
749 vs.
Jacob Ocepek.

On writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Commissioner of Immigration of Port of New York, Petitioner,
855 vs.
Gittel Gottlieb et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the petitioner, and by Mr. Joseph G. M. Browne, Mr. Barnett E. Kopelman, and Mr. J. Philip Berg for the respondent.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
18, Orig'l. vs.
The State of Texas, defendant; the United States, Intervener.

On motion of Mr. Henry E. Asp in that behalf, leave was granted to file stipulation and petition in intervention of Mary Alice Sah-maunty et al.

M. Frank Andrews, Plaintiff in Error,
253 vs.
The United States of America.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of South Carolina, and Mr. Solicitor General Beck, of counsel for the defendant in error, having filed a confession of error and moved the Court to reverse the judgment herein,

It is, therefore, in pursuance of said confession and motion, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Puget Sound Power & Light Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
653 vs.
The County of King et al.

The motion to reinstate this cause on the docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

St. Johns N. F. Shipping Corporation, Owner, etc., Petitioner,
385 vs.
S. A. Companhia Geral Commercial do Rio de Janeiro.

The motion to dismiss or affirm under Rule 6, or to advance, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. Curtis Rouse for the respondent, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Clarence Bishop Smith for the petitioner in opposition thereto.

The People of the State of New York on the relation of Emeline F. Clyde, Plaintiff in Error,
318 vs.
James A. Wendell, as Comptroller of the State of New York.

ORDER.

Pursuant to a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties in this cause, heretofore filed in this Court,

It is now here ordered by this Court that Walter M. Law, Jr., President, John J. Merrill, and Walter H. Knapp, as Members of the State Tax Commission of the State of New York, be substituted, in the place and stead of James A. Wendell, as Comptroller of the State of New York, as the parties defendants in error in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The People of the State of New York ex rel. Emeline F. Clyde, Plaintiff in Error,
318 vs.
State Tax Commission of the State of New York.

On motion of Mr. Edward J. Crummey in that behalf, this cause was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

Edward A. Thurston, Sole Surviving Trustee, etc., Petitioner,
827 vs.
Benjamin Brown et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Sears for the petitioner.

James K. Cochran and Harris Kobey, Plaintiffs in Error,
498 vs.
Coulton M. Becker.

The motion to dismiss or affirm herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Oliver J. Miller for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Harris Kobey, pro se, in opposition thereto.

Objection to the appearance of Mr. Oliver J. Miller and to his admission to practice as a member of the bar of this court was submitted by Mr. Harris Kobey; and the objection was overruled.

Jesse C. Adkins et al., etc., Appellants,
795 vs.
The Children's Hospital of the District of Columbia; and
Jesse C. Adkins et al., etc., Appellants,
796 vs.
Willis A. Lyons.

On motion of Mr. Francis H. Stephens in behalf of counsel for the State of Kansas, leave was granted to file brief herein as amicus curiae.

J. H. Hodges et al., etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
432 vs.
G. T. Snyder et al., etc., et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Max Royhl in behalf of Mr. T. H. Hull for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Samuel Herrick for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Frank H. Snell et al., Petitioners,
867 vs.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the considera-

in behalf of Mr. William M. Toomer for the petitioners, and by Mr. Samuel Silbiger for the respondents.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Complainant,
20, Original. vs.
The State of New York et al.

On motion of Mr. J. Weston Allen in that behalf, John Albert Granger, as heir-at-law of Anna T. Granger, deceased, and his wife, Emma R. Granger, and Gideon Granger, as heir-at-law of Anna T. Granger, deceased, were substituted as parties defendants herein in place of Anna T. Granger, deceased.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Complainant,
20, Original. vs.
The State of New York et al.

The motion by certain defendants for leave to amend their answers heretofore filed herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Daniel M. Beach, Mr. Arthur E. Sutherland, and Mr. Clarence P. Moser in that behalf.

Hannah Levine, Petitioner,
821 vs.
Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John L. Wilkie for the petitioner, and by Mr. Van Vechten Veeder for the respondent.

Edmond C. Fletcher, Petitioner,
830 vs.
Isaiah S. Coomes et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Camden R. McAtee for the petitioner.

Joseph Phipps et al., etc., Petitioners,
835 vs.
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John G. Parkinson for the petitioner.

Jacksonville Forwarding Company, Petitioner,
844 vs.
County of Nassau, State of Florida.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George C. Bedell for the petitioners, and by Mr. Martin H. Long for the respondent.

Southern Railway Company, Appellant,
686 vs.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of North Carolina.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Board of Trade of the City of Chicago et al., Appellants,
701 vs.
Edwin A. Olsen, United States District Attorney for the Northern District of Illinois.

On motion of Mr. Henry S. Robbins in that behalf, three hours were allowed for the argument of this case. The case was argued by Mr. Henry S. Robbins for the appellants, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee.

Charles Keller et al., Appellants,
260 vs.
Potomac Electric Power Company.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. John A. Garver for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, February 27th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Dale, it is ordered that G. B. Ross, Esquire, of Galveston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Josiah Marvel, it is ordered that Caleb S. Layton, Esquire, of Wilmington, State of Delaware, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Townsend, it is ordered that Albert W. Black, Esquire, of Bay City, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David A. Reed, it is ordered that Bowdoin U. McClintock, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Franklin B. Lord, it is ordered that George deForest Lord, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Charles Keller et al., Appellants, 260 vs. Potomac Electric Power Company.	The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. John A. Garver for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. F. H. Stephens for the appellants.
Fox Film Corporation, Petitioner, 310 vs. Frederick M. Knowles et al.; and Fox Film Corporation, Petitioner, 311 vs. Frederick M.Knowles et al.	These cases were argued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the petitioner, and by Mr. Louis R. Bick for the respondents.
H. H. Arnold, etc., Plaintiff in Error, 320 vs. The United States, etc.	This case was submitted by Mr. William H. White for the plaintiff in error, and argued by Mr. Frank C. Tompkins for the defendant in error.
Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Company, Plaintiff in Error, 633 vs. Sophia Kierejewski, as Administratrix, etc.	This case was argued by Mr. George Clinton, Jr., for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Irving W. Cole for the defendant in error.
The Pusey & Jones Company, Petitioner, 431 vs. Hans Karluf Hanssen.	This cause was argued by Mr. Lindley M. Garrison for the petitioner, and by Mr. William H. Sutton for the respondent.
Albert B. Fall, Secretary of the Interior, Plaintiff in Error, 25 vs. United States ex rel. W. T. Mosier et al.	The re-argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. C. Edward Wright for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, February 28th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Curtis, it is ordered that G. A. Spencer, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. J. Leahy, it is ordered that Arthur T. Woodward, Esquire, of Pawhuska, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Julian C. Dowell, it is ordered that Henry Hudson, Esquire, of Knoxville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Wilder, it is ordered that Joseph M. Proskauer, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Wood, it is ordered that George P. Haywood, Esquire, of Lafayette, and Edgar D. Randolph, Esquire, of Lafayette, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Albert B. Fall, Secretary of the Interior, Plaintiff in Error, 25 vs. The United States ex rel. W. T. Mosier et al.	The re-argument of this case was continued by Mr. C. Edward Wright for the plaintiff in error, and concluded by Mr. T. J. Leahy for the defendants in error.
Yuma County Water Users' Association et al., Appellants, 268 vs. W. W. Schlecht et al.	This case was argued by Mr. T. D. Molloy for the appellants, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Riter for the appellees.
Harriet Stocker, et al., Plaintiffs in Error, 130 vs. Nemaha Drainage District No. 2.	This case was submitted by Mr. Halleck F. Rose, Mr. George N. Foster, and Mr. T.R.P. Stocker for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Fred A. Wright for the defendant in error.
Albert Hanson Lumber Company (Ltd.), Plaintiff in Error, 300 vs. The United States.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. E. Howard McCaleb for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, March 1st, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

Willis Van Devanter,

James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.

Louis D. Brandeis,

George Sutherland,

Pierce Butler,

Edward T. Sanford.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John E. Baker, it is ordered that Charles L. Hayes, Esquire, of Bridgeport, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fritz G.Lanham, it is ordered that E. H. Ratcliff, Jr., Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Addison T. Smith, it is ordered that W. G. Bissell, Esquire, of Gooding, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, it is ordered that George A. Chace, Esquire, of Rochester, State of New York, and Isaiah J. Fetterhoff, Esquire, of Halifax, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John P. Earnest, it is ordered that Alfred K. Nippert, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of

this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John P. Earnest, it is ordered that John Wilson Brown, 3d, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. McSwain, it is ordered that Clendius Russell Marshall, Esquire, of Columbia, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward T. Fenwick, it is ordered that Carle Whitehead, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Horace S.Whitman, it is ordered that Alexander H. McCormick, Esquire, of Westminster, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert W. Jefferis, it is ordered that Robert G. Simmons, Esquire, of Scotts Bluff, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George M. Morris, it is ordered that Frederic N. Watriss, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry E. Kelly, it is ordered that Benson Landon, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, it is ordered that George E. Crothers, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Morrill Moores, it is ordered that Horace M. Towner, Esquire, of Corning, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Albert Hanson Lumber Company (Ltd.), Plaintiff in Error,
300 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. E. Howard McCaleb for the plaintiff in error, and concluded by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the defendant in error.

John Owen, Petitioner,
92 vs.
American Fidelity Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. William H. Wilder for the petitioner, and by Mr. Joseph M. Proskauer for the respondent.

Omnia Commercial Company (Inc.), Appellant,
229 vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. George Maurice Morris for the appellant, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Riter for the appellee.

The United States, Appellant,
231 vs.
Bernard L. Moran; and
The United States, Appellant,
232 vs.
Will J. Allen.

These cases were argued by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Seymour for the appellant, and by Mr. George A. King for the appellees.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
284 vs.
Public Service Commission of Missouri.

This cause was argued by Mr. Frank E. Atwood for the defendant in error, and case submitted by Mr. E. T. Miller and Mr. William F. Evans for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, March 2nd, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter H. Newton, it is ordered that George W. Plank, Esquire, and Warren H. Stewart, Esquire, of St. Cloud, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles L. McNary, it is ordered that Charles W. Halderman, Esquire, of Astoria, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John D.Carmody, it is ordered that Charles G. Keene, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred S.Purnell, it is ordered that William J. Sprow, Esquire, of Crawfordsville, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Newcorn, it is ordered that Joseph E. Stricker, Esquire, of Perth Amboy, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John L. Cable, it is ordered that Thomas A. Billingsley, Esquire, of Greenville, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Aaron V. Dawes, it is ordered that Charles E. Bird, Esquire, of Trenton, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Department of Trade and Commerce of the State of Nebraska et al., Petitioners,
467 vs.
A. J. Hertz et al., etc., Receivers, etc.; and
Lion Bonding & Surety Company, Petitioner,
574 vs.
A. H. Karatz.

The motion of Clarence C. Fowler for leave to file a brief herein as amicus curiae on behalf of the Superintendent of Insurance of the State of New York was denied.

Department of Trade and Commerce of the State of Nebraska et al., Petitioners,
467 vs.
A. J. Hertz et al., etc., Receivers, etc.; and
Lion Bonding & Surety Company, Petitioners,
574 vs.
A. H. Karatz.

The City of Trenton, Plaintiff in Error,
480 vs.
The State of New Jersey; and

These cases were argued by Mr. Halleck F. Rose for the petitioners, and by Mr. Bruce W. Sanborn for the respondent.

The City of Newark, Plaintiff in Error,

469 vs.

The State of New Jersey.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. A. V. Dawes for the plaintiff in error in No. 430, continued by Mr. George W. Wickersham for the plaintiff in error in No. 469, and concluded by Mr. William Newcorn for the defendant in error.

The United States, Appellant,

121 vs.

Mason & Hanger Company; and

The United States, Appellant,

122 vs.

North-Eastern Construction Company.

The reargument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Ralph E. Moody for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, March 5th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur M. Beal, it is ordered that Stuart S. Janney, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter Bruce Howe, it is ordered that Melvin C. Goss, Esquire, of Boulder, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. Barnard Welsh, it is ordered that Thomas M. Talbott, Esquire, of Rockville, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Paul Earnest, it is ordered that George Wolf, Esquire, of New York City, and Abner Siegal, Esquire, of Auburn, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert H. Lovett, it is ordered that James M. Hammond, Esquire, of Carson City, State of Nevada, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, it is ordered that C. Nelson Leach, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois; Forest D. Siefkin, Esquire, and L. P. Brooks, Esquire, of Wichita, State of Kansas; and Thomas H. Lewis, Jr., Esquire, of Chevy Chase, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. Riter, it is ordered that Harrison M. Davis, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Herbert L. Davis, it is ordered that James Austin Stone, Esquire, and J. Hanson Boyden, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Gorham Crosby, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander T. Vogelsang, it is ordered that John F. Kerrigan, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Guaranty Trust Company, and William C. Cox, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States. — In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

407

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of South Carolina, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The United States of America
and The City of New York,
Plaintiffs in Error,
394 vs.
George F. Benedict, as Sole
Surviving Trustee of the
Trusts Created by the Last
Will and Testament of William
C. Langley, deceased.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, as to The United States of America, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York.

It is further ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error, in this cause, as to The City of New York, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Oklahoma Natural Gas Company,
Appellant,
406 vs.
Campbell Russell, Art L. Walker,
and E. R. Hughes, constituting
the Corporation Commission of the
State of Oklahoma, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Oklahoma Gas & Electric Company and Muskogee Gas & Electric Company, Appellants, vs. Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, Campbell Russell, et al.

419 — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas.

18, Orig'l. — It is ordered by this Court that the petition in intervention of John Tah Hah et al. be filed in accordance with the stipulation that the evidence introduced in said cause by any of the parties shall be taken as evidence as to these intervenors, and that the rights of said intervenors may be determined by the decree to be rendered herein.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Trust Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. S. S. McNinch et al.

716 — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Trust Company
Plaintiff in Error,
716 vs.
S. S. McNinch et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James K. Cochran et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
498 vs.
Coulton M. Becker.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harriet Stocker et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
150 vs.
Nemaha Drainage District
No. 2.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

St. Johns N. F. Shipping Corporation, Owner, etc.,
Petitioner,
385 vs.
S. A. Companhia Geral Commercial

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm or advance in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Puget Sound Power & Light Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error, 653 vs. The County of King et al.

On consideration of the motion to reinstate this cause to the docket, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Complainant, 20, Original. vs. The State of New York et al.

On consideration of the motion of New York Central Railroad Company, Central Union Trust Company of New York, Ontario Beach Hotel and Amusement Company, and Bartholomay Company, Inc., certain of the defendants herein, for leave to amend their answers heretofore filed,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Sperry Oil & Gas Company et al., Appellants, 751 vs. Pearl Chisholm et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward A. Thurston, Sole Surviving Trustee, etc., Petitioner, 827 vs. Benjamin Brown et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the

argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph Phipps et al., Petitioners.
835 vs.
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Commissioner of Immigration of the Port of New York, Petitioner,
855 vs.
Gittel Gottlieb et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ward Grandpre, Petitioner,
799 vs.
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to The Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hannah Levins, Petitioner,
821 vs.
Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Lucking, Appellant, vs. Detroit & Cleveland Navigation Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

826

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edmond C. Fletcher, Petitioner, vs. Isaiah S. Coomes et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to The Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

830

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jacksonville Forwarding Company, Petitioner, vs. County of Nassau, State of Florida. — On petition for writ of certiorari to The Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

844

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank H. Snell et al., Petitioners, vs. Frank Snell Sawmill Company et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

867

United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

ORDER.

It is ordered by the Court that the accompanying correspondence between members of the Court and Mr. Justice Pitney, upon his retirement as an Associate Justice of the Court, be this day spread upon the record, and that it also be printed in the reports of the Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Washington, D. C., February 24, 1923.

My dear Brother Pitney:

We write to assure you of our sincere appreciation as a colleague and to express our deep regret that failing health has compelled you to give up the work which you love, and in which you have rendered signal service to our country.

After four years in the Federal Congress and three years in the New Jersey State Senate, whose presiding officer you were, you became a Justice of the Supreme Court of the State, and ultimately the Chancellor. Your father's distinguished career on the same equity bench gave you a high standard to follow. With this seven years of legislative training and eleven years of judicial experience, you were called to our Court, fully equipped for its responsible duties.

For ten years you have given unremitting labor to the work of the Court - the consideration of cases, the preparation of your own opinions and the most careful examination and criticism of the opinions of your colleagues. You have spared yourself in nothing. We cannot but think that you have sacrificed your health in the earnest effort to do everything possible to further the work of the Court. Your opinions in thirty-four volumes - 22b to 259 - show a splendid sense of responsibility, accurate learning, thorough research, able reasoning, nice sense of justice and careful preparation.

We shall miss your kindly companionship, your genial courtesy, your loyalty and your high sense of judicial duty. Our love follows you in retirement. May the years to come give you well-earned repose and happiness.

With affectionate regard, we are,

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) William H. Taft
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Willis Van Devanter
James Clark McReynolds
Louis Dembitz Brandeis.

Hon. Mahlon Pitney,
1763 R Street, N. W.,
Washington, D.C."

"Washington, D. C., March 3, 1923.

My dear Chief Justice:

Your letter touched me more deeply than I can tell you. To you, and to my dear brethren of the Court, I owe ten of the happiest years of my life.

Your unvarying kindness, consideration, and helpfulness did everything to stimulate my ambition to win your esteem; and if through over-work I have undermined my health, I feel fully repaid by the appreciation expressed, in your letter, of my usefulness to the Court.

It is with the deepest regret that I am compelled to retire from the Bench; but it ever will be a source of consolation and pleasure to look back upon the days we spent together.

With assurance of my affectionate regards to you all, I am,

Yours fraternally,

(Signed) Mahlon Pitney.

Hon. William H. Taft,
Chief Justice."

Commercial Trust Company of New Jersey, Appellant, 575 vs. Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian; and Charles J. Ahrenfeldt, Appellant, 576 vs. Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian.

The motion to advance these causes to be heard with No. 292 on April 9th next, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Blackburn Esterline in that behalf.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, 18, Original. vs. The State of Texas, Defendant; The United States, Intervener.

The joint motion for leave to withdraw the prayer contained in the pleadings of each party asking that the boundary line be run, located, and marked upon the ground; and, in lieu thereof, that this court, by its decree based on the

opinion of January 15, 1923, provide and direct that the commissioners to be appointed shall run, locate, and mark said boundary line along two described areas, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Blackburn Esterline in that behalf.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
18, Original. vs.
The State of Texas,
Defendant;
The United States,
Intervenor.

The motion for leave to file stipulation as to rights of certain patentees and Indian allottees, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Blackburn Esterline in that behalf.

The State of New York,
Complainant,
22, Original. vs.
Harry M. Daugherty,
Attorney General of the
United States, et al.

On motion of Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the defendants, leave was granted to file answer herein.

Walter Burke, Petitioner,
854 vs.
The United States of
America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. R. Rush and Mr. W. M. Spooner for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim and Mr. H. S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Simon Hecht et al.,
Petitioners,
532 vs.
John F. Malley, Former
Collector of Internal
Revenue;
Arthur L. Howard et al.,
Petitioners,
533 vs.
John F. Malley, Former
Collector of Internal
Revenue;

Arthur L. Howard et al.,
Petitioners,
534 vs.
Andrew J. Casey, Former Acting
Collector of Internal Revenue;
and
Alvah Crocker et al., Trustees,
Petitioners,
587 vs.
John F. Malley, Collector.

The motion to reassign these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Blackburn Esterline in that behalf.

Nathaniel P. Lesueur et al., etc., Petitioners,
849 vs.
Manufacturers' Finance Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James S. Pilcher for the petitioners, and by Mr. John J. Vertrees for the respondent.

Ex parte In the matter of
James C. Davis, as Director
General of Railroads, etc.,
Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of prohibition and/or a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James W. Ryan and Mr. T. Catesby Jones for the petitioner.

Layne and Bowler Corporation,
Petitioner,
278 vs.
Western Well Works (Inc.), et al.

The motion of Mr. Charles C. Montgomery for leave to file reply brief herein as amicus curiae was denied.

Sven Haavik, Appellant,
627 vs.
Alaska Packers Association.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston in behalf of counsel.

Alfred Street, suing on behalf
of himself and other seamen, etc.,
Appellant,
704 vs.
Ship Owners' Association of the

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston in behalf of counsel.

Russell Motor Car Company, Appellant,
485 vs.
The United States.

On motion of Mr. Louis Titus in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief herein as amicus curiae.

Henry M. Goldfogle, President, etc., et al., etc., Petitioners,
837 vs.
Hanover National Bank of the City of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. King, Mr. George P. Nicholson, Mr. Frank B. Kellogg, Mr. Eugene Fay, and Mr. Charles L. Pierce, for the petitioners, and by Mr. E. F. Colladay, Mr. Martin Saxe, Mr. Percy S. Dudley, Mr. Frank M. Patterson, and Mr. Morton E. Lewis for the respondent; with leave to counsel for the respondent to file reply to petitioners' reply brief.

The City of New York, Petitioner,
858 vs.
Rodgers & Hagerty (Inc.)

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. King in behalf of Mr. Edmund L. Mooney and Mr. Terence Farley for the petitioner, and by Mr. C. C. Calhoun for the respondent.

Samuel C. Pandolfo, Petitioner,
860 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Patrick J. Lucey, Mr. Gerald C. Barry, and Mr. Bernhardt Frank for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Norfolk Southern Railroad Company, Petitioner,
842 vs.
Thomas V. Gordon.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert N. Simms and Mr. C. M. Bain for the petitioner, and by Mr. William C. Douglas and Mr. Clyde A. Douglas for the respondent.

Supreme Lodge, Knights of Pythias, Plaintiff in Error,
832 vs.
George O. Meyer; and
Supreme Lodge, Knights of Pythias, Plaintiff in Error,

833 vs.
Lena Eiser.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sidney F. Taliaferro, Mr. Sol H. Esarey, and Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition, with leave to counsel for the plaintiff in error to file printed record when completed.

George H. Sever, Petitioner,
829 vs.
Director General of Railroads.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John E. Benton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edwin A. Lawrence for the respondent.

Lehigh & Hudson River Railway Company, Petitioner,
805 vs.
Florence M. Otterstedt, on behalf of herself and minor children.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John J. Beattie for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. Clarence Aiken for the respondent.

James C. Davis, as Agent, etc., Petitioner,
857 vs.
Marguerite Clark, Administratrix of Charles Almon Clark, deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bruce Scott, Mr. A. A. McLaughlin, and Mr. C. M. Spencer for the petitioner, and by Mr. Tom Davis and Mr. Ernest A. Mickel for the respondent.

Alabama Grocery Company, Petitioner,
861 vs.
L. P. Hammond, Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lee C. Bradley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Forney Johnston for the respondent.

Charles A. Houts et al., Appellants,
713 vs.
W. E. McKinney, as Guardian, etc., et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States,
Appellant,
121 vs.
Mason & Hanger Company;
and
The United States,
Appellant,
122 vs.
North-Eastern Construction
Company.

The reargument of these cases was continued by Mr. Ralph E. Moody for the appellant, and cases submitted by Mr. William B. King, Mr. George A. King, and Mr. George R. Shields for the appellees.

Layne & Bowler Corporation,
Petitioner,
278 vs.
Western Well Works (Inc.)
et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. F. S. Lyon for the petitioner, and by Mr. C. E. Townsend for the respondents.

L. Vogelstein & Company
(Inc.), Appellant,
269 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. A. G. Reeves for the appellant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, March 6th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

Willis Van Devanter,

James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.

Louis D. Brandeis,

George Sutherland,

Pierce Butler,

Edward T. Sanford.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. O'Brien, it is ordered that William L. Igoe, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Theo. E. Burton, it is ordered that Harry C. Gahn, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry J. Gerrity, it is ordered that Henry N. Longley, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

L. Vogelstein & Company,(Inc.),
Appellant,
269 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for the appellant.

Russell Motor Car Company,
Appellant,
485 vs.
The United States; and

Henry Freygang et al., etc.,
Appellants,
480 vs.
The United States.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Lyman M. Bass for the appellant in No. 485; continued by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Lyman M. Bass for the appellant in No. 485.

Albert & J. M. Anderson Manufacturing Company,
Appellant,
740 vs.
The United States.

This case was submitted by Mr. Chapman W. Maupin and Mr. Arthur H. Russell for the appellant, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Lovett, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. Alexander H. McCormick for the appellee.

The St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company,
Appellant,
184 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Benjamin Carter for the appellant, and continued by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, March 7th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, it is ordered that Joseph B. Jacobs, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otis Wingo, it is ordered that James D. Head, Esquire, of Texarkana, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry L. Underwood, it is ordered that Michael A. Rattigan, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company, Appellant,
184 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Benjamin Carter for the appellant.

Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Appellant,
208 vs.
The United States.

This case was argued by Mr. John F. McCarron for the appellant, and by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the appellee.

Hartford Life Insurance Company, Petitioner,
265 vs.
Frank F. Dowds et al., etc.,
and
Hartford Life Insurance Company, Petitioner,
271 vs.
Robert H. Langdale.

These cases were argued by Mr. Smith W. Bennett for the respondents, and cases submitted by Mr. Harry B. Arnold, Mr. James C. Jones, Mr. Frank H. Sullivan, and Mr. James C. Jones, Jr., for the petitioners.

Madera Sugar Pine Company, Plaintiff in Error,
235 vs.
Industrial Accident Commission of California et al.; and
Madera Sugar Pine Company, Plaintiff in Error,
296 vs.
Industrial Accident Commission of California et al.

These cases were argued by Mr. Adolphus E. Graupner for the defendants in error, and cases submitted by Mr. H. E. Barbour for the plaintiff in error.

Federal Land Bank of New Orleans, Plaintiff in Error,
428 vs.
D. W. Crossland, Judge of Probate.

This case was argued by Mr. William C. Dufour for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. James J. Mayfield for the defendant in error.

The United States, Plaintiff in Error,
316 vs.
New River Collieries Company.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Riter for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, March 8th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins, it is ordered that Frank P. Nesbit, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States, Appellant,
307 vs.
American Linseed Oil Company
et al.

On motion of Mr. John Walsh in that behalf, this case was passed, per stipulation.

The United States, Plaintiff in Error,
316 vs.
New River Collieries Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Riter for the plaintiff in error, and concluded by Mr. Ira Jewell Williams for the defendant in error.

The State of Texas, Plaintiff in Error,
679 vs.
Eastern Texas Railroad Company
et al.; and
The State of Texas, Appellant,
680 vs.
Eastern Texas Railroad Company.

These cases were argued by Mr. W. A. Keeling for the plaintiff in error and appellant, and by Mr. John R. Turney for the defendants in error and appellee.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
215 vs.
Sinclair Refining Company;
Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
637 vs.
Standard Oil Company (New Jersey);
Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
638 vs.
Gulf Refining Company;
and
Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
639 vs.
Maloney Oil Manufacturing Company.

On motion of Mr. A. F. Busick in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of J. H. Hayes for respondent in No. 637 by Monday next and reply thereto by Wednesday next.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Adrian F. Busick for the petitioner, continued by Mr. Roy T. Osborn for the respondent in No. 215, and by Mr. C. D. Chamberlin for the respondent in No. 639.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, March 9th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

Willis Van Devanter,

James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.

Louis D. Brandeis,

George Sutherland,

Pierce Butler,

Edward T. Sanford.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Selden P.Spencer, it is ordered that Edward D. Hays, Esquire, of Cape Girardeau, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur G. Hays, it is ordered that Clarence E. Mellen, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ewin L. Davis, it is ordered that W. C. Salmon, Esquire, of Columbia, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Eugene L. Culver, it is ordered that Francis L. Sward, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Houston Coal Company, Plaintiff in Error,

365 vs.

The United States.

On motion of Mr. R. L. Batts for Ira Jewell Williams, leave was granted to file brief herein as amicus curiae.

J. S. Cullinan, Plaintiff in Error,
301 vs.
A. S. Walker, as Collector, etc.

On motion of Mr. James Byrne in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief herein as amicus curiae.

J. S. Cullinan, Plaintiff in Error,
301 vs.
A. S. Walker, as Collector, etc.

On motion of Mr. Arthur A. Ballantine in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief herein as amicus curiae.

The Bracher Lumber Company, etc., et al., Appellants,
314 vs.
Southern Railway Company.

This case was submitted by Mr. T. M. Stevens and Mr. Edgar Watkins for the appellants, and by Mr. Gregory L. Smith for the appellee.

King County, Washington, Appellant,
315 vs.
Seattle School District No.1.

On motion of Mr. Frederic D. McKenney in that behalf, this case was passed, per stipulation, to be restored to the call pursuant to section 9 of Rule 26.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner,
215 vs.
Sinclair Refining Company;
Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner,
637 vs.
Standard Oil Company (New Jersey);
Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner,
638 vs.
Gulf Refining Company;
and
Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner,
639 vs.
Pelonzo Oil Manufacturing Company.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. R. L. Batts for the respondent in No. 638, and concluded by Mr. Eugene W. Burr for the petitioner.

J. S. Cullinan, Plaintiff in Error, 301 vs. A. S. Walker, as Collector, etc.	This case was argued by Mr. John Walsh for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the defendant in error.
Will F. Thomas, Sheriff, etc., et al., Appellants, 303 vs. Kansas City Southern Railway Company, et al.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. James D. Head for the appellants, and continued by Mr. S. W. Moore for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, March 12th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that George C. Clarke, Esquire, William A. Maidens, Esquire, Leo P. Watson, Esquire, Clarence O. Webb, Esquire, Percy S. Crewe, Esquire, and William R. Green, Jr., Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; Frank L. Tyson, Esquire, of New York City; Franklin P. Shaw, Esquire, of Ft. Thomas, State of Kentucky; Preston O. Alexander, Esquire, of Gallatin, State of Missouri; and Jesse E. Jacobson, Esquire, of Wheatland, State of Wyoming, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alex. W. Smith, it is ordered that Theodore H. Smith, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, it is ordered that Lionel P. Kristeller, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Challen B. Ellis, it is ordered that Elizabeth Cahoone Harris, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this

Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Herbert L. Davis, it is ordered that Alexander Cooper Proudfit, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur E. Dowell, it is ordered that Maurice E. Page, Esquire, of Binghamton, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur M. Boal, it is ordered that Bernhard Knollenberg, Esquire, of Honolulu, Hawaii, and Coleman Silbert, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. Riter, it is ordered that C. C. Parsons, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, it is ordered that Weld A. Rollins, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Pullman Company, Plaintiff in Error,
143 vs.
Friend W. Richardson, as Treasurer of the State of California.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The Pullman Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
144 vs.
Friend W. Richardson, as
Treasurer of the State of
California.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The Pullman Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
145 vs.
Friend W. Richardson, as
Treasurer of the State of
California.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The Pullman Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
146 vs.
Friend W. Richardson, as
Treasurer of the State of
California.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The Pullman Company, Plaintiff
in Error,
147 vs.
Friend W. Richardson, as
Treasurer of the State of
California.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The Pullman Company, Plaintiff
in Error,
148 vs.
Friend W. Richardson, as
Treasurer of the State of
California.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Walker D. Hines, as Director
General of Railroads, and the
Pullman Company, Plaintiffs in
Error,
149 vs.
Friend W. Richardson, as Treasurer
of the State of California.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

John Ewen, Petitioner,
92 vs.
American Fidelity Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Fox Film Corporation,
Petitioner,
510 vs.
Frederick M. Knowles et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Fox Film Corporation,
Petitioner,
511 vs.
Frederick M. Knowles,
"William" O. McWatters,
etc.; Harry Meyers, and
Joseph S. Klein.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was

argued by counsel.

On consideration thereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant,
The United States, Intervener.

No. 18, Original.

Partial Decree Relating to State Boundary.

[March 12, 1923.]

This cause having been heard and submitted upon certain questions, and the court having considered the same and announced its conclusions in an opinion delivered January 15, 1923,

It is ordered, adjudged, and decreed:

1. The boundary between the States of Oklahoma and Texas, where it follows the course of the Red River from the 100th meridian of west longitude to the eastern boundary of the State of Oklahoma, is part of the international boundary established by the treaty of 1819 between the United States and Spain, and is on and along the south bank of that river as the same existed in 1821, when the treaty became effective, save as hereinafter stated.

2. Where intervening changes in that bank have occurred through the natural and gradual processes known as erosion and accretion the boundary has followed the change; but where the stream has left its former channel and made for itself a new one through adjacent upland by the process known as avulsion the boundary has not followed the change, but has remained on and along what was the south bank before the change occurred.

3. Where, since 1821, the river has cut a secondary or additional channel through adjacent upland on the south side in such a way that land theretofore on that side has become an island, the boundary is along that part of the south bank as theretofore existing which by the change became the northerly bank of the island; and where by accretion or erosion there have been subsequent changes in that bank the boundary has changed with them.

4. The rules stated in the last two paragraphs will be equally applicable to such changes as may occur in the future.

5. The south bank of the river is the water-washed and relatively permanent elevation or acclivity, commonly called a cut bank, along the southerly side of the river which separates its bed from the adjacent upland, whether valley or hill, and usually serves to confine the waters within the bed and to preserve the course of the river.

6. The boundary between the two States is on and along that bank at the mean level attained by the waters of the river when they reach and wash the bank without overflowing it.

7. At exceptional places where there is no well defined cut bank, but only a gradual incline from the sand bed of the river to the upland, the boundary is a line over such incline conforming to the mean level of the waters when at other places in that vicinity they wash and wash the cut bank without overflowing it.

8. The area known as the Big Bend, which lies within a northerly bend of the river between a southerly extension of the east line of range thirteen west in Oklahoma and a southerly extension of the west line of range fourteen west in that State, has been since before 1821 fast upland on the southerly side of the river, is within the State of Texas and never was owned by the United States. The northerly border of that area is part of the south bank of the river on and along which the state boundary extends.

9. Burke Bet Island and Goat Island, both of which are in the vicinity of the Big Bend Area, are islands in the river, have been islands since before 1821, are within the State of Oklahoma, and are the property of the United States.

10. The island in front of the line between Hardeman and Wilbarger Counties, in the State of Texas, was part of the fast valley land on the south side of the river in 1821, and was severed from the land on that side by avulsion in 1902. The island is within the State of Texas and the state boundary is along its northerly bank.

11. The treaty of 1819 secures to the inhabitants of the State of Texas a right of reasonable access to the waters of the river along the state boundary, such as will enable them to reach the waters at all stages and to use the same for beneficial purposes in common with the inhabitants of the State of Oklahoma and of other parts of the United States.

12. The two States and the United States having joined in a request that they be permitted to withdraw the prayer in their pleadings that the boundary for its full length along the river be run, located and marked upon the ground, and having also joined in a further request that the boundary be run, located and marked only at the places hereinafter named, the requests are granted, and Arthur D. Kidder and Arthur L. Stiles, both cadastral engineers, are designated as commissioners to run, locate and mark upon the ground the following portions of the boundary in accordance with this decree and the principles announced in the opinion delivered January 15, 1923.

(a) Along the Big Bend Area as hereinbefore defined;

(b) From the Big Bend Area westward to a southerly extension of the west line of range sixteen west in Oklahoma;

(c) Along all places where by avulsion since 1821 the river has come to occupy a new channel whereby fast upland theretofore on one side of the river has come to be on the other side,—the line in every such instance to be run, located and marked on and along what was the south bank before the change occurred; and

(d) Along any other places which either State or the United States may designate in a request in writing approved by a member of this court.

13. The mode of marking those portions of the boundary shall be by establishing in the vicinity thereof permanent monuments upon the fast upland on the southerly side of the river at suitable distances apart and carefully taking the distances and courses from such monuments to the boundary as the same exists at the time the work is done. A description of the monuments and a statement of such distances and courses shall be included in the report of the commissioners.

14. Before they enter upon their work each commissioner shall take and subscribe an oath to perform his duties faithfully and impartially. They shall prosecute the work with all convenient dispatch, shall have authority to employ such assistants as may be needed therein, and shall include in their final report a statement of the work done and of the time employed and the expenses incurred in its performance.

15. The boundary along the Big Bend Area as hereinbefore defined shall be run, located, monumented and reported to the court before the commissioners take up other portions of the work. In

running and locating that part of the boundary the commissioners shall ascertain the exact location of all oil wells which are within three hundred feet of the same and shall include a statement thereof in their report.

16. The work of the commissioners shall be subject in all its parts to the approval of the court. Copies of their reports shall be promptly delivered to the two States and the United States, and exceptions or objections thereto, if there be such, shall be presented to the court, or, if it be not in session, filed with the Clerk, within forty days after the report is made.

17. If for any reason there be a vacancy in the commission when the court is not in session the same may be filled by the designation of a new commissioner by the Chief Justice.

18. The cost of executing this decree, including the compensation of the commissioners, shall be borne in equal parts by the State of Oklahoma, the State of Texas and the United States.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant,
The United States, Intervener. } **18, Original.**

Supplement to Partial Decree of June 5, 1922.

[March 12, 1923.]

On consideration of the several stipulations, suggestions and supporting briefs relating to the entry of a further decree to supplement the partial decree entered June 5, 1922, under the opinion delivered May 1, 1922,

It is ordered, adjudged, and decreed:

1. This supplemental decree relates only to the bed of the Red River, and to lands bordering on the north side of the same, between the 98th meridian of west longitude and the mouth of the North Fork.

2. The several interveners who, under patents or Indian allotments by the United States, own lands bordering on the north side of the river are severally the owners of so much of the bed of the river as lies in front of their lands and north of the medial line of the river, except as is otherwise stated herein.

3. Where, under grants from the United States, the State of Oklahoma owns lands bordering on the north side of the river the State has the same riparian rights in the river bed that an individual owning the same lands under a patent or Indian allotment would have.

4. The full title and ownership of so much of the bed of the river as lies south of its medial line are in the United States.

5. In the sense intended herein, the medial line of the river is a line drawn midway between the northerly and southerly banks of the river, commonly called cut banks, save that, under a stipulation between the parties affected, to which full effect must be given,

this line, in so far as it reaches and is in contact with patented or allotted tracts which are within what is now the bed of the river, shall be regarded and treated as falling no farther north than the southerly line of such tracts as the same were represented by the official survey according to which they were patented or allotted.

6. Where tracts on the north side of the river, which were not riparian when surveyed, were patented or allotted after they had become riparian, such disposals carried the title to the medial line of the river, unless other tracts between them and that line had been disposed of theretofore, in which event the later disposals did not carry any right in, or affect the title to, such intervening tracts.

7. Where tracts on the north side, which had come to be in the river bed after survey and before disposal, were patented or allotted as if they were upland, while the adjacent land behind them which was then actually riparian was as yet unsold and unallotted, such disposals carried the title to the medial line of the river, unless other tracts between them and that line had been disposed of theretofore, in which event the later disposals did not carry any right in, or affect the title to, such intervening tracts.

8. The patenting and allotting of lands bordering on the north side of the river did not carry or give any right to islands in the river which were in existence at that time.

9. The patent issued for lot 1 of section 35 in township 4 south of range 14 west, under which the intervener E. Everett Rowell is now claiming, carried the right and title to the river bed between such lot and the medial line of the river.

10. The patent issued for lots 1 and 2 of section 8 in township 5 south of range 14 west, under which the interveners A. E. Pearson, et al., are now claiming, carried the right and title to the river bed between such lots and the medial line of the river.

11. The patent issued for the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 7 in township 5 south of range 14 west, under which the interveners A. E. Pearson, et al., are now claiming, invested the patentee with the full ownership of the land within the limits of that tract as shown on the plat of the official survey, but did not carry any right or title to any part of the river bed as an incident to the disposal of that tract.

12. The patent issued for lots 6 and 7 of section 7 in township 5 south of range 14 west, under which the interveners Robert L. Owen, et al., are now claiming, carried the right and title to the river bed between such lots and the medial line of the river.

13. The allotments in severalty made of the following tracts, to or on behalf of the Indians named, respectively included and covered the right and title to the portions of the river bed between such tracts and the medial line of the river.

HENRY BOOT-PAWLE

Allotment No. 3332, Kiowa, 1910.

E½ of the NE¼ and lot 4 of section 33, twp. 5 S., range 12 W.

WEBSTER LONEWOLF

Allotment No. 3327, Kiowa, 1910.

W½ of the NE¼ and lot 3 of section 33, twp. 5 S., range 12 W.

AMY LAURA BEAR

Allotment No. 3361, Kiowa, 1910.

E½ of NW¼ and lot 2 of section 33, twp. 5 S., range 12 W.

MARY HUMMINGBIRD

Allotment No. 3315, Kiowa, 1910.

W½ of NW¼ and lot 1 of section 33, twp. 5 S., range 12 W.

ALICE CARPIO

Allotment No. 2419, Comanche, 1910.

Lot 4 of section 32, twp. 5 S., range 12 W.

ISABEL TSA-TAH-SIS-KO
Allotment No. 3280, Apache, 1910.
Lot 3 of section 24, twp. 5 S., range 13 W.

RICHARD KO-SOPE, Deceased.
Allotment No. 3279, Apache, 1910.
Lot 5 of section 23, twp. 5 S., range 13 W.

JULIA MAH-SEET
Allotment No. 3430, Comanche, 1910.
Lot 4 of Section 23, twp. 5 S., range 13 W.

WILLIAM QUO-IN-QUODLE
Allotment No. 3312, Kiowa, 1910.
N½ of the NW¼ and the SE¼ of the NW¼ of section 23, twp. 5 S., range 13 W.

ALBERT AUN-KO
Allotment No. 3298, Kiowa, 1910.
SE¼ of the SW¼ and the SW¼ of the SE¼ of section 10; and lot 1 of section 15, all in township 5 S., range 13 W.

EDGAR KAU-BIN
Allotment No. 3318, Kiowa, 1910.
NE¼ of the SW¼ and the NW¼ of the SE¼ and lot 1 of section 10, twp. 5 S., range 13 W.

CORA TSO-ODLE, Deceased
Allotment No. 3292, Kiowa, 1910.
Lots 4 and 5 and the SW¼ of the NW¼ of section 4, twp. 5 S., range 13 W.

NED ODLE-PAH-QUOTE, Deceased
Allotment No. 3299, Kiowa, 1910.
Lots 1 and 2 and the SE¼ of the NE¼ of section 5, twp. 5 S., range 13 W.

LENA HO-AH-WAH
Allotment No. 3405, Comanche, 1910.
NE¼ of the SE¼ and lot 7 of section 31, and the NW¼ of the SW¼ of section 32, all in twp. 4 S., range 13 W.

LILY BLACK BEAR
Allotment No. 3281, Apache, 1910.
NE¼ of the SW¼ of section 31, twp. 4 S., range 13 W.

JOHN PAUT-CHEE
Allotment No. 3390, Comanche, 1910.
Lots 3 and 4 of section 31, twp. 4 S., range 13 W.

JOSIE STAR
Allotment No. 3283, Apache, 1910.
N½ of the NE¼ and lot 2 of section 35, twp. 4 S., range 14 W.

GEORGE ASE-PERM-MY
Allotment No. 3432, Comanche, 1910.
Lot 3 of section 35, twp. 4 S., range 14 W.

EMMA A-ONE-TY
Allotment No. 3306, Kiowa, 1910.
N½ of the NW¼ and lot 4 of section 35, twp. 4 S., range 14 W.

JAMES TOO-AH-IMP-AH

Allotment No. 3423, Comanche, 1910.

E½ of the NW¼ and lots 2 and 3 of section 34, twp. 4 S., range 14 W.

DAY TAH-TOO-AH-NI-PAH

Allotment No. 3385, Comanche, 1910.

W½ of the NW¼ and lot 4 of section 34, twp. 4 S., range 14 W.

RAY DO-YAH

Allotment No. 3303, Kiowa, 1910.

N½ of the SE¼ and lots 1 and 2 of section 33, twp. 4 S., range 14 W.

CYNTHIA BERRY

Allotment No. 3282, Apache, 1910.

Lot 2 of section 4, twp. 5 S., range 14 W.

MAGGIE TURTLE MOUNTAIN REID

Allotment No. 3293, Kiowa, 1910.

SW¼ of the NE¼ and lots 2 and 6 of section 5, twp. 5 S., range 14 W.

ROBERT TO-QUOTHY

Allotment No. 3413, Comanche, 1910.

N½ of the SW¼ and lot 5 of section 5, and lot 3 of section 8, all in twp. 5 S., range 14 W.

GEORGE EMAU-AH, Deceased.

Allotment No. 3364, Kiowa, 1910.

Lots 3 and 4 of section 7, twp. 5 S., range 14 W.

LOUIS SAH-KOODLE-QUOIE, Deceased.

Allotment No. 3326, Kiowa, 1910.

Lots 1 and 2 of section 12, twp. 5 S., range 15 W.

FANNIE ZO-TIGH, Deceased

Allotment No. 3320, Kiowa, 1910.

E½ of the SE¼ of section 11, and lots 2 and 3 of section 14, twp. 5 S., range 15 W.

WILLIAM TIX-SEY

Allotment No. 3396, Comanche, 1910.

N½ of the SW¼ and lot 1 of section 11, twp. 5 S., range 15 W.

ALICE WARE

Allotment No. 3307, Kiowa, 1910.

Lot 2 of section 10, twp. 5 S., range 15 W.

DORA AU-TAU-BO

Allotment No. 3295, Kiowa, 1910.

Lot 4 of section 9, twp. 5 S., range 15 W.

MARTIN TOPAUM

Allotment No. 3305, Kiowa, 1910.

E½ of the SW¼ of section 4, and lot 2 of section 9, twp. 5 S., range 15 W.

WILLIAM BOINTY

Allotment No. 3291, Kiowa, 1910.

W½ of the SW¼ of section 4, lot 1 of section 9, and lot 6 of section 5, all in twp. 5 S., range 15 W.

RICHARD HUMMINGBIRD

Allotment No. 3317, Kiowa, 1910.

Lot 7 of section 6, twp. 5 S., range 15 W.

CYNTHIS LOOKING-GLASS

Allotment No. 3416, Comanche, 1910.

Lot 4 and the SE¼ of the SW¼ of section 19, and lot 2 of section 30, all in twp. 4 S., range 16 W.

ERNEST WESLEY GALLAHER

Allotment No. 3348, Kiowa, 1910.

N½ of the NW¼ and lot 3 of section 35, twp. 5 S., range 12 W.

MARY TSA-TSA-TINE, Deceased.

Allotment No. 3368, Kiowa, 1910.

Lot 1 of section 35, twp. 5 S., range 12 W.

LULU PE-SAU-NY

Allotment No. 3409, Comanche, 1910.

E½ of the SE¼ and lot 4 of section 15, twp. 5 S., range 13 W.

LIZZIE PO-HOC-SU-CUT

Allotment No. 3399, Comanche, 1910.

NE¼ of the SW¼ and lot 5 of section 7, all in twp. 5 S., range 14 W.

NETTIE GOOM-DO

Allotment No. 3322, Kiowa, 1910.

Lots 3 and 4 of section 10, twp. 5 S., range 15 W.

14. The allotments in severalty made of the following tracts, to or on behalf of the Indians named, respectively included and covered the right and title to the portions of the river bed between such tracts and the medial line of the river, save that this paragraph must be understood to be without prejudice to any rights which other persons or allottees may have in virtue of prior or contemporary disposals or allotments of other tracts between those described and that line:

FRANCIS CHANATE

Allotment No. 3333, Kiowa, 1910.

W½ of the NE¼ and the NW¼ of the SE¼ of section 13, twp. 5 S., range 12 W.

VELMA-MI-HE-COPY

Allotment No. 3428, Comanche, 1910.

NE¼ of NE¼ of section 9, twp. 5 S., range 13 W.

MAGGIE HUMMINGBIRD, Deceased

Allotment No. 3314, Kiowa, 1910.

NW¼ of the SW¼ and the S½ of the SW¼ of section 12, twp. 5 S., range 15 W.

ROB-PEET-SUE-NI

Allotment No. 3382, Kiowa, 1910.

W½ of the SE¼ and lot 2 of section 11, twp. 5 S., range 15 W.

CARL YE-AH-QUE

Allotment No. 3362, Kiowa, 1910.

SW¼ of the SW¼ of section 3, and W½ of the NW¼ of section 10, twp. 5 S., range 15 W.

CYNTHIA COZAD

Allotment No. 3345, Kiowa, 1910.

Lots 1 and 2 of section 4, twp. 5 S., range 16 W.

JESSE LOCKE

Allotment No. 3403, Comanche, 1910.

SW¼ of the SW¼ of section 33, and the E½ of the SE¼ of section 32, twp. 4 S., range 16 W.

JOHN AH-KE-AH-BO

Allotment No. 3288, Kiowa, 1910.

NE¼ of the NE¼ and the S½ of the NE¼ of section 32, twp. 4 S., range 16 W.

LOUIS COZAD

Allotment No. 3343, Kiowa, 1910.

NE¼ of the SW¼ and the W½ of the SW¼ of section 29, twp. 4 S., range 16 W.

MAUD KHODA KO-SE-PE-AH

Allotment No. 3388, Comanche, 1910.

SW¼ of the NW¼ of section 29, and the SE¼ of the NE¼ and the NE¼ of the SE¼ of section 30, twp. 4 S., range 16 W.

CARRIE GEIOGEMAH

Allotment No. 3351, Kiowa, 1910.

NE¼ of the NE¼ and W½ of the NE¼ of section 30, twp. 4 S., range 16 W.

FLORENCE CALISAY

Allotment No. 3349, Kiowa, 1910.

NE¼ of the SW¼ and the N½ of the SE¼ of section 12, twp. 5 S., range 15 W.

MARY ALICE SAH-MAUNTY

Allotment No. 3360, Kiowa, 1910.

N½ of the SW¼ and the SW¼ of the SE¼ of section 35, twp. 4 S., range 16 W.

PHILOMENA SENOYA

Allotment No. 3441, Comanche, 1910.

W½ of the SW¼ of section 36 and the SE¼ of the SE¼ of section 35, twp. 4 S., range 16 W.

HATTIE JONES

Allotment No. 3324, Kiowa, 1910.

NW¼ of the SE¼ and the E½ of the SW¼ of section 36, twp. 4 S., range 16 W.

JOHN TAH-HAH

Allotment No. 3401, Comanche, 1910.

E½ of the SE¼ and the SW¼ of the SE¼ of section 36, twp. 4 S., range 16 W.

MONTGOMERY FULLER

Allotment No. 3420, Comanche, 1910.

E½ of the NE¼ and the NE¼ of the SE¼ of section 10, twp. 5 S., range 15 W.

ELTON PAH-CHE-KA

Allotment No. 3414, Comanche, 1910.

W½ of the NE¼ and NW¼ of the SE¼ of section 10, twp. 5 S., range 15 W.

15 The receiver is directed to surrender, as soon as conveniently may be done, the possession of all patented and allotted tracts on the northerly side of the medial line which are within the receivership area and are without an oil well; and after the possession of any such tract is so surrendered that tract shall be regarded as fully discharged from the receivership.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter

The United States, Appellant,
252 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.
Will J. Allen.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The United States, Appellant,
251 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.
Bernard L. Moran.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Roland R. Pothier, Appellant,
--- vs.
William R. Rodman, United States Marshal, and Henry C. Hart, United States Commissioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to docket this cause and proceed in forma pauperis herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

It is further ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, transferred to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, pursuant to the Act of Congress of September 14, 1922, (42 Stats. 837).

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The City of New York, Appellant,
588 vs.
New York Telephone Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjuiged, and decreed

by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

Commercial Trust Company of New Jersey, Appellant,
575 vs.
Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian.
Charles J. Ahrenfeldt, Appellant,
576 vs.
Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases for argument with No. 292, as one case,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument, as one case, with No. 292, requested to be restored to the call for Monday, April 9th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sven Haavik, Appellant,
627 vs.
Alaska Packers Association.
Alfred Street, suing on behalf of himself and all other seamen engaged in interstate and foreign commerce by sea, etc., Appellant,
704 vs.
Shipowners' Association of the Pacific Coast et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases placed on the summary docket and assigned for argument on Monday, November 5th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
18, Orig'l. vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant;
The United States, Intervener.

On consideration of the joint motion for leave to amend pleadings, for a decree, and for leave to file stipulation,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Simon Hecht et al., Petitioners,

532 vs.
John F. Malley, Former Collector of Internal Revenue.

Arthur L. Howard et al., Petitioners,
533 vs.
John F. Malley, Former Collector of Internal Revenue.

Arthur L. Howard et al., Petitioners,
534 vs.
Andrew J. Casey, Former Acting Collector of Internal Revenue.

Alvah Crocker et al., Trustees, Petitioners,
587 vs.
John F. Malley, Collector.

On consideration of the motion to reassign these cases,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases reassigned for argument on Monday, November 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of prohibition and/or a writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lehigh & Hudson River Railway Company, Petitioner,
805 vs.
Florence M. Otterstedt, on behalf of herself and minor children.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Third Department, of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Third Department, of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied, for failure to submit the petition within the time prescribed by the rule.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Tidal Oil Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. J. P. Flanagan. 764

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George H. Sever, Petitioner, vs. Director General of Railroads. 829

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry M. Goldfogle, President, et al., Petitioners, vs. Hanover National Bank of the City of New York. 837

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Norfolk Southern Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Thomas V. Gordon. 848

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Nathaniel P. Lesueur et al., etc., Petitioners, vs. Manufacturers' Finance Company. 849

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, as Agent, etc., Petitioner, vs. Marguerite Clark, Administratrix, etc. 857

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The City of New York, Petitioner, vs. Rodgers & Hagerty, Inc. 858

On petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel C. Pandolfo, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 860

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alabama Grocery Company,
Petitioner,
861 vs.
L. P. Hammond, Trustee, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Brasher Lumber Company, for the use of itself, et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
314 vs.
Southern Railway Company.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Alabama.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Alabama, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced that the court will take a recess from Monday, the 19th instant, until Monday, April 9th next.

Harry T. Graham, Individually, etc., et al., Petitioners,
846 vs.
Alfred I. DuPont.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioners.

Walter S. Hallanan, State Tax Commissioner, etc., et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
885 vs.
The Eureka Pipe Line Company;
and
Walter S. Hallanan, State

Tax Commissioner, etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
569 vs.
The Eureka PipeLine Company.

The motion to dismiss or affirm; or, in the alternative, either to order this cause transferred for hearing to the summary docket under section 6 of rule 6, or to advance it for early argument under section 4 of rule 26, as a case once adjudicated by this court upon the merits, was submitted to the consideration of the court by Mr. Frank L. Crawford and Mr. James M. Beck for the defendant in error and respondent in support of the motion, and by Mr. E. T. England, Mr. S. B. Avis, Mr. William G. Matthews, and Mr. Fred O. Blue for the plaintiffs in error and petitioners in opposition thereto.

Jay Burns Baking Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
522 vs.
Samuel R. McKelvie, as Governor of the State of Nebraska, et al.

The motion to reinstate this cause to the docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Matthew A. Hall for the plaintiffs in error, with consent thereto.

Robert W. Hunt et al.,
Petitioners,
898 vs.
D. L. Gillespie.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. C.Stone for the petitioner, and by Mr. David A. Reed and Mr. George H. Calvert for respondent, with leave to file copies of the printed record hereafter.

Walter S. Hallanan, State Tax Commissioner, etc., et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
886 vs.
United Fuel Gas Company; and
Walter S. Hallanan, State Tax Commissioner, et al.,
Petitioners,
570 vs.
United Fuel Gas Company.

The motion to dismiss or affirm herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Malcolm Jackson and Mr. R. C. Altizer for the defendant in error and respondent in support of the motion, and by Mr. E. T. England, Mr. S. B. Avis, Mr. William G. Matthews, and Mr. Fred O. Blue for the plaintiffs in error and petitioners in opposition thereto.

Jesse C. Adkins et al., etc.,
Appellants,

795 vs.
The Children's Hospital of the
District of Columbia; and
Jesse C. Adkins et al., etc.,
Appellants,
796 vs.
Willie A. Lyons.

On motion of Mr. F. H. Stephens in behalf of counsel for the Minimum Wage Board of the State of Washington, leave was granted to file brief herein as amicus curiae.

The People of the State of New York ex rel. Emeline F. Clyde, Plaintiff in Error,
518 vs.
State Tax Commission of the State of New York.

The motion to dismiss or affirm herein was submitted to the consideration of the court by Mr. E. J. Crummey in behalf of Mr. James S. Y. Ivins for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. E. J. Crummey and Mr. Arthur E. Goddard for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

George P. Clark Company, Petitioner,
879 vs.
Knebler Foundries (Inc.)

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Willard Paff and Mr. Calvin F. Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. Mitchell Palmer and Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., for respondent.

Liberty National Bank of Roanoke, Virginia, Petitioner,
889 vs.
James A. Bear, Trustee, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James D. Johnston for the petitioner.

Peter Rulovitch et al., Petitioners,
902 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John J. O'Brien for the petitioners.

Atlantic & Yadkin Railway Company, Appellant,
687 vs.

A. D. Watts, etc., Commissioner of Revenue, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of North Carolina.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Will F. Thomas, Sheriff, etc., et al., Appellants,
305 vs.
Kansas City Southern Railway et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. J. B. McDonough for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Otis Wingo for the appellants.

Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Appellant,
305 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. J. F. McCarron for the appellant. The Court declined to hear counsel for the appellee.

The People of the State of New York ex rel. Thomas F. Doyle, Plaintiff in Error,
306 vs.
George C. Atwell, Acting Chief of Police of the City of Mount Vernon, et al.

This case was submitted by Mr. Frederick E. Weeks for the defendants in error.

The City National Bank of El Paso, Texas, Petitioner,
309 vs.
El Paso & Northeastern Railroad Company et al.

This case was argued by Mr. A. H. Culwell for the petitioner, and by Mr. William R. Harr for the respondent.

The J. M. Macdonald Coal Mining Company, Appellant,
313 vs.
The United States.

This case was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Hiter for the appellee, and case submitted by Mr. William S. Hammers for the appellant.

The State of North Dakota,
Complainant,
11, Original. vs.
The State of Minnesota.

On motion of Mr. M. H. Boutelle in that behalf, three and one-quarter hours were allowed for the argument of this case. The argument was commenced by Mr. M. H. Boutelle for the complainant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, March 13th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, it is ordered that Harry M. Ehrlich, Esquire, and Henry Locker, Esquire, of Springfield, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

William R. Warner & Company,
Petitioner,
322 vs.
Eli Lilly & Company.

This cause was continued, per stipulation of counsel.

State of North Dakota, Complainant,
11, Orig'l. vs.
State of Minnesota.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. M. H. Boutelle for the complainant, and concluded by Mr. M. J. Brown for the defendant.

The Page Company, Plaintiff in Error,
308 vs.
Lucy Maud Montgomery Macdonald, etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. Asa P. French for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Weld A. Rollins for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, March 14th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hiram T. Gilbert, it is ordered that William A. Adams, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles D. Chamberlin, it is ordered that William J. Meyer, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Elmore D. Dier et al., Appellants,
330 vs.
Joab H. Banton, District Attorney, etc., et al.

Pacific Gas & Electric Company, Appellant,
331 vs.
City and County of San Francisco;
Pacific Gas & Electric Company, Appellant,

On motion of Mr. Otto Schlobohm in that behalf, it is ordered that this case be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

332 vs.

City and County of San Francisco;

and

Pacific Gas & Electric Company,

Appellant,

333 vs.

City and County of San Francisco.

It is ordered that these cases be passed, per stipulation.

Jesse C. Adkins et al., etc.,

Appellants,

795 vs.

The Children's Hospital of the District of Columbia; and

Jesse C. Adkins et al., etc.,

Appellants,

796 vs.

Willie A. Lyons.

Four hours were allowed for the argument of these cases. The argument was commenced by Mr. Felix Frankfurter for the appellants; continued by Mr. William L. Brewster in behalf of the States of Oregon, New York, California, Kansas, Wisconsin, and Washington, as amici curiae; by Mr. Challen B. Ellis and Mr. Wade H. Ellis for the appellees; and concluded by Mr. Felix Frankfurter for the appellants.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank S. Bright, it is ordered that Louis L. Hamby, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. Bowdoin Craighill, it is ordered that Louis H. Cooke, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States, Appellant,
429 vs.
The State of Tennessee et al.

On motion of Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the appellant, this case was advanced, to be heard as one case with No. 396, heretofore assigned for argument on Monday, April 9th next.

Arthur W. Ide et al.,
Appellants,
534 vs.
The United States.

On motion of Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the appellee, this case was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

Wyoming Railway Company,
Appellant.

338 vs.
The United States et al.

On motion of Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the appellee, this case was passed, to be heard with No. 377, as one case, when No. 377 is reached for argument.

International Life Insurance Company, Plaintiff in Error,
295 vs.
Adrian P. Sherman.

This case was argued by Mr. Charles G. Revelle for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Oscar S. Hill for the defendant in error.

Frank C. Gardner, as Trustee, etc., Petitioner,
317 vs.
Chicago Title & Trust Company, Receiver, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. Arthur M. Cox for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. T. Gilbert for the respondent.

W. H. Phipps et al., Appellants,
324 vs.
The Cleveland Refining Company of Cleveland, Ohio.

This case was argued by Mr. William J. Meyer for the appellants, and by Mr. Charles D. Chamberlin for the appellee.

South Utah Mines & Smelters, Plaintiff in Error,
321 vs.
Beaver County.

This case was argued by Mr. C. C. Parsons for the plaintiff in error, and case submitted by Mr. Harvey H. Cluff and Mr. William A. Hilton for the defendant in error.

Jewel Redwine, Plaintiff in Error,
325 vs.
The State of Texas.

This case was submitted on briefs to be filed.

Virginia Huey et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
327 vs.
D. A. Brock et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. George H. Lamar for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John F. Miller, it is ordered that R. L. Dent, Esquire, of Vicksburg, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George H. Lamar, it is ordered that Theodore J. Lamar, Esquire, of Birmingham, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

American Bank & Trust Company,
Appellant,
717 vs.
Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta.

The motion to advance herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. SolicitorGeneral Beck for the appellee.

Farmers and Merchants Bank of Monroe, North Carolina, et al.,
Petitioners,
823 vs.
Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond, Virginia.

The motion to advance herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the respondent.

The United States
202 vs.

Bhagat Singh Thind.

On motion of Mr. William R. King for Bhagat Singh Thind, stay of mandate until the end of the term was granted.

Virginia Huey et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
327 vs.
D. A. Brock et al.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. George H. Lamar for the plaintiffs in error. No appearance for the defendants in error.

Eli Bunch, Plaintiff in Error,
328 vs.
J. B. Cole et al.

This case was submitted by Mr. Dennis T. Flynn, Mr. Streeter B. Flynn, and Mr. Robert M. Rainey for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Benjamin Martin, Jr., for the defendant in error.

Roy H. Robinson, Administrator, etc., Appellant,
335 vs.
The United States.

This case was argued by Mr. Charles H. Merillat for the appellant, and by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the appellee.

Toledo Scale Company, Petitioner,
339 vs.
The Computing Scale Company; and Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland et al., Petitioners,
388 vs.
The Computing Scale Company et al.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. George D. Welles for the Toledo Scale Company, continued by Mr. Frederick P. Fish for the Toledo Scale Company, by Mr. Charles Markell for Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland et al., and concluded by Mr. John M. Zane for the Computing Scale Company et al.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, March 19th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford. Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that Orion N. Gibson, Esquire, of Riverton, State of Wyoming, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Herbert W. Clark, it is ordered that Oscar O. Askren, Esquire, of Las Vegas, State of New Mexico, and William C. Mullendore, Esquire, of Winfield, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wade H. Ellis, it is ordered that John P. Stokes, Esquire, of Pensacola, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Oscar W. Underwood, Jr., it is ordered that Benjamin Leader, Esquire, of Birmingham, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alex. Britton, it is ordered that Horace Greeley Eastburn, Esquire, of Wilmington, State of Delaware, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. King, it is ordered that Harry M. Wade, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham, it is ordered that Daniel W. Knowlton, Esquire, of New York City, and J. Carter Fort, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James L. Fort, it is ordered that Horace Russell, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George M. Morris, it is ordered that Julian Clay Risk, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Benjamin B. Pettus, it is ordered that George P. Whitman, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Frear, it is ordered that T. L. McIntosh, Esquire, of Superior, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert H. Lovett, it is ordered that Benjamin Franklin Goldstein, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. Walter Arts, it is ordered that Robert J. Eby, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Augustus O. Stanley, it is ordered that Henry T. Hardin, Esquire, of Evansville, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Appellant,
208 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.
The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Arkansas Natural Gas Company, Appellant,
500 vs. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas.
Arkansas Railroad Commission, City of Pine Bluff, Town of Sheridan, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Federal Land Bank of New Orleans, Plaintiff in Error,
428 vs. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.
D. W. Crossland, Judge of Probate.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this

Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Federal Land Bank of New Orleans, Plaintiff in Error,
428 vs.
D. W. Crossland, Judge of Probate.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company and James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
284 vs.
Public Service Commission of the State of Missouri.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Opinion by Mr. Justice McKenna.
(Announced by Mr. Chief Justice Taft).

Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, Plaintiff in Error,
25 vs.
The United States of America on the relation of W. T. Mosier and Louisa Mosier.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this

Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia with directions to dismiss the petition.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Appellant,
510 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.
Nelson W. Rider.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

Harry T. Graham, Individually, etc., et al., Petitioners,
846 vs.
Alfred I. DuPont.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 23d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Bank & Trust Company, Appellant,
717 vs.
Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 23d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Farmers & Merchants Bank of Monroe, North Carolina, et al., Petitioners,
823 vs.

Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond,
Virginia.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 23d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jay Burns Baking Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
522 vs.
Samuel R. McKelvie, as Governor of the State of Nebraska, et al., etc.

On consideration of the motion to reinstate this case to the docket, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

It is further ordered by this Court that a rule issue to show cause why the case should not be dismissed for lack of statutory authority to substitute the new Governor for the Ex-Governor, in view of Irwin v. Webb, decided March 20, 1922, and United States v. Butterworth, 169 U. S. 600.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mary Partridge, Plaintiff in Error,
410 vs.
J. E. Crosbie et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause having been reported to the Court by the Clerk, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mary Partridge, Plaintiff in Error,
410 vs.
J. E. Crosbie et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for failure to comply with the rule as to printing record.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Liberty National Bank of Roanoke, Virginia, Petitioner,
889 vs.
James A. Bear, Trustee, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Supreme Lodge, Knights of Pythias, Plaintiff in Error,
832 vs.
George O. Meyer.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Supreme Lodge, Knights of Pythias, Plaintiff in Error,
833 vs.
Lena Eiser.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Walter Burke, Petitioner,
864 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George P. Clark Company, Petitioner,
879 vs.
Knebler Foundries, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to

the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Peter Rulovitch et al., Petitioners. On petition for writ of certiorari
902 vs. to the United States Circuit Court
The United States of America. of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The J. M. MacDonald Coal Mining
Company, Appellant, Appeal from the Court of Claims.
313 vs.
The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jewel Redwine, Plaintiff in Error, In Error to the Court of Criminal
326 vs. Appeals of the State of Texas.
The State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Criminal Appeals of the State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Criminal Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Virginia Huey et al., Plaintiffs In Error to the Supreme Court of
in Error, the State of Alabama.
327 vs.
D. A. Brock et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Eli Bunch, Plaintiff in Error,
328 vs.
J. B.Cole et al.

It is ordered by this Court that counsel file further briefs in this cause citing and dealing with all material statutes, are claimed to have been void. and particularly those under which leases

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Albert B. Fall, Secretary of the Interior, et al., Appellants,
258 vs.
The United States ex rel. McAllister-Edwards Coal Company.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf, Hubert Work, present Secretary of the Interior, was substituted as a party appellant herein.

Albert B. Fall, Secretary of the Interior, Plaintiff in Error,
25 vs.
The United States of America ex rel. W. T. Mosier et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf, Hubert Work, present Secretary of the Interior, was substituted as the party plaintiff in error.

Vincente Gordero, Plaintiff in Error,
912 vs.
The United States.

Mr. Solicitor General Beck, of counsel for the defendant in error, having filed in open Court the following certificate, to-wit: "I, Antonio Aguayo, Clerk of the District Court of the United States for the District of Porto Rico, do hereby certify that in a certain cause pending in said Court, wherein United States of America was plaintiff, and Vicente Gordero & Pedro Rodriguez (Re: Habeas Corpus) were defendants, a final judgment was rendered by said Court on the 19th day of April, A. D. 1922, in favor of the said United States, and against the said Vicente Gordero, etc., and that on the 22nd day of April, A. D. 1922, said Vicente Gordero sued out a writ of error to said District

Court, directed to remove said cause to the Supreme Court of the United States.

In testimony whereof I hereunto subscribe my name and affix the seal of said District Court, at San Juan, this 7th day of March, A. D. 1923.

(SEAL). (Signed) ANTONIO AGUAYO, Clerk."

and moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the ninth rule,

And it appearing to the Court that the plaintiff in error has failed to have his cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court,

It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause from the District Court of the United States for Porto Rico be, and the same is hereby, docketed and dismissed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Simon Hecht et al., Trustees,
Petitioners,
532 vs.
John F. Malley, Former Collector of Internal Revenue;
Arthur L. Howard et al., Trustees, Petitioners,
533 vs.
John F. Malley, Former Collector of Internal Revenue;
and
Arthur L. Howard et al., Trustees,
Petitioners,
534 vs.
Andrew J. Casey, Former Acting Collector of Internal Revenue.

The motion to reassign these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf.

Southern Railway Company,
Appellant,
756 vs.
A. D. Watts, Commissioner of Revenue, etc., et al.

The motion to substitute R. A. Doughton, present Commissioner of Revenue of the State of North Carolina, as a party appellee herein, was submitted by Mr. S. R. Prince

in that behalf.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Appellant, 724 vs. A. D. Watts, Commissioner of Revenue, etc., et al.

The motion to substitute R. A. Doughton, present Commissioner of Revenue of the State of North Carolina, as a party appellee herein, was submitted by Mr. S. R. Prince in that behalf.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Appellant, 744 vs. A. D. Watts, Commissioner of Revenue, etc., et al.

The motion to substitute R. A. Doughton, present Commissioner of Revenue of the State of North Carolina, as a party appellee herein, was submitted by Mr. S. R. Prince in that behalf.

Norfolk Southern Railroad Company. Appellant, 727 vs. A. D. Watts, Commissioner of Revenue, etc., et al.

The motion to substitute R. A. Doughton, present Commissioner of Revenue for the State of North Carolina, as a party appellee herein, was submitted by Mr. S. R. Prince in that behalf.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Complainant, 20, Orig'l. vs. The State of New York et al.

The motion for leave to file motion to dismiss bill of complaint and to fix a date for the hearing on the motion, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., in behalf of counsel.

John W. Talbot, Petitioner, 856 vs. The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Julian Clay Risk in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief herein as amicus curiae.

Dean Sherry, Trustee, etc., et al., Petitioners, 843 vs. J. B. Lucas.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. J. Butts for the petitioners.

John W. Talbot, Petitioner, 856 vs. The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Cassius C. Shirley and Mr. Lars A. Whitcomb for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General John W. H. Crim and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Window Glass Machine Company et al., Petitioners,
868 vs.
Pittsburgh Plate Glass Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clarence P. Byrnes, Mr. Livingston Gifford, and Mr. David A. Reed for the petitioners, and by Mr. Marshall A. Christy and Mr. George B. Gordon for the respondent.

The Pusey & Jones Company, Petitioner,
872 vs.
Willard Saulsbury et al., Receivers, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lindley M. Garrison, Mr. Charles H. Tuttle, and Mr. Saul S. Myers for the petitioner, and by Mr. William H. Button, Mr. John P. Nields, and Mr. William G. Mahaffy for the respondents.

The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company, Petitioner,
877 vs.
Edmund R. Wells et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander Britton, Mr. A. H. Culwell, Mr. J. W. Terry, and Mr. Gardiner Lathrop for the petitioner, and by Mr. George E. Wallace for the respondents.

Herbert W. Baker, Administrator of the Estate of Charles W. Oliver, deceased, Petitioner,
882 vs.
John Barton Payne, Director General, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank S. Monnett for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. Walter Doheny and Mr. Frank E. Robson for the respondent.

The Frieberg Mahogany Company, Petitioner,
891 vs.
The Batesville Lumber & Veneer Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Murray Seasongood for the petitioner, and by Mr. Judson Harmon and Mr. George Hoadly for the respondent.

Nassau Smelting & Refining Works, Petitioner,
897 vs.
Brightwood Bronze Foundry Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph B. Jacobs for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harry M. Ehrlich and Mr. Henry Lasker for the respondent.

Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. McKinley C. Myers.

900

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bruce Scott for the petitioner, and by Mr. William Buchholz, Mr. I. B. Kimbrell, and Mr. Martin J. O'Donnell for the respondent.

Sam M. Saliba et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America.

904

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Forney Johnston for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

The Pusey & Jones Company, Petitioner, vs. Willard Saulsbury et al., Receivers, etc.

872

On motion of Mr. J. Noble Hays in behalf of the Merchants' Association of the City of New York, leave was granted to file brief herein as amicus curiae, if consented to by counsel of record for the respondent.

Superior Water, Light & Power Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. City of Superior et al., etc.

436

The motion to dismiss the writ of error in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. L. McIntosh and Mr. C. M. Wilson for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Harry L. Butler and Mr. Frank B. Kellogg for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, April 9 next, at 12 o'clock.

Monday, April 9th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

Willis Van Devanter,

James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.

Louis D. Brandeis,

George Sutherland,

Pierce Butler,

Edward T. Sanford.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fulton M. Brylawski, it is ordered that Charles E. Quirollo, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., it is ordered that Oscar W. Newman, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fulton M. Brylawski, it is ordered that Sidney L. Struble, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James L. Fort, it is ordered that Mac Asbill, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl D. Jackson, it is ordered that Fred W. Putnam, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William A. Oldfield, it is ordered that Melbourne M. Martin, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, it is ordered that Henry W. Pennock, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Melville D. Church, it is ordered that Reuben Satterthwaite, Jr., of Wilmington, State of Delaware, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John C. Myers, it is ordered that W. J. Wetherbee, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter Nelles, it is ordered that Albert De Silver, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Miss Mary O'Toole, it is ordered that Isabella Olive Beatty, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Claudian B. Northrop, it is ordered that G. L. B. Rivers, Esquire, of Charleston, State of South Carolina, and Dayton Hunter, Esquire, of Elizabethton, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George M. Morris, it is ordered that Harry D. Thirkield, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert H. Lovett, it is ordered that Lisle A. Smith, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Tuttle, it is ordered that David Haar, Esquire, and Maurice L. Sheine, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Marion C. Early, it is ordered that William T. Jones, Esquire, of St. Louis, and Merrill E. Otis, Esquire, of Jefferson City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Abbott P. Mills, it is ordered that Philip H. Jones, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The People of the State of New York ex rel. Thomas F. Doyle et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
306 vs.
George C. Atwell, Acting Chief of Police of the City of Mount Vernon, and People of the State of New York.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Appellant,
305 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

J. H. Hodges, Nick Hoffman, Walter Anderson, et al., etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
432 vs.
C. T. Snyder, C. W. Walkow, A. C. Walkow, et al., as Members of the Board of Education of the purported Consolidated School District named and known as Erwin Independent Consolidated School District No. 1 of Kingsbury County, South Dakota, et al., etc., et al.

In Error to the Circuit Court of Kingsbury County, Ninth Judicial Circuit, of the State of South Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Circuit Court of Kingsbury County, Ninth Judicial Circuit, of the State of South Dakota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Circuit Court of Kingsbury County, Ninth Judicial Circuit, of the State of South Dakota, to proceed to comply with the judgment of the Supreme Court of that State.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Thomas C. Watkins, Trustee, et al., Petitioners,
248 vs.
J. H. Sedberry et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed

by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Tennessee in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Albert Hanson Lumber Company, Limited, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America. — In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

300

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Omnia Commercial Company, Inc., Appellant, vs. The United States. — Appeal from the Court of Claims.

229

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Russell Motor Car Company, Appellant, vs. The United States. — Appeal from the Court of Claims.

485

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the

Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Henry Freygang and Albert A. Trecon, Partners doing Business under the Firm Name of the Midland Bridge Company, Appellants,

460 vs.

The United States. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Albert and J. M. Anderson Manufacturing Company, Appellant,

740 vs.

The United States. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Jesse C. Adkins, Ethel M. Smith, John J. Newbold, constituting the Minimum Wage Board of the District of Columbia, Appellants,

795 vs.

The Children's Hospital of the

District of Columbia.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Dissenting:

Mr. Chief Justice Taft,
Mr. Justice Holmes,
Mr. Justice Sanford.

(Mr. Justice Brandeis took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

Jesse C. Adkins, Ethel M. Smith,
John J. Newbold, constituting
the Minimum Wage Board of the
District of Columbia, Appellants,
796 vs.
Willie A. Lyons.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Dissenting:

Mr. Chief Justice Taft,
Mr. Justice Holmes,
Mr. Justice Sanford.

(Mr. Justice Brandeis took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

Will F. Thomas, Sheriff and Collector;
Little River Drainage and Levee District
of Sevier County, No. 1, et al.,
Appellants,
303 vs.

Kansas City Southern Railway
and Texarkana and Fort Smith
Railway Company.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Arkansas.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Roy H. Robinson, Administrator of the Estate of
John C. Robinson, deceased,
Appellant,
335 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Putney and Jones Company,
Petitioner,
431 vs.
Hans Karluf Hanssen.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed

by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Delaware for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna,
Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner, vs. Sinclair Refining Company. 213 — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner, vs. Standard Oil Company (New Jersey). 637 — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner, vs. Gulf Refining Company. 638 — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued

by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner, vs. Maloney Oil and Manufacturing Company. 659

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Hartford Life Insurance Company, Petitioner, vs. Frank P. Douds, Herman J. Douds, and Rebecca E. McConkey, Executors, etc. 265

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Hartford Life Insurance Company, Petitioner, vs. Robert H. Langdale. 271

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this

Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Great Lakes Dredge and Dock Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Sophia Kierejewski, as Administratrix of the Personal Estate of Lee Kierejewski, deceased. 633

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Wabash Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Miles Elliott. 225

On writ of certiorari to the Kansas City Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Kansas City Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Kansas City Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Kansas City Court of Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Frank G. Gardner, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of the O'Gara Coal Company, Petitioner, vs. Chicago Title & Trust Company, as Receiver of the LaSalle Street Trust and Savings Bank. 317

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Page Company, Plaintiff in Error,
308 vs.
Lucy Maud Montgomery MacDonald, etc., a Resident of the Province of Ottawa in the Dominion of Canada and a British Subject now Commorant in the District of Massachusetts.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

W. H. Phipps and W. H. Phipps, as Director of the Department of Commerce of the State of Ohio, Appellant,
324 vs.
The Cleveland Refining Company of Cleveland, Ohio.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio,

and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Layne & Bowler Corporation, Petitioner, vs. Western Well Works, Inc., et al. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

278

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Walter S. Hallanan, State Tax Commissioner, and E. T. England, Attorney General, of the State of West Virginia, Petitioners, vs. The Eureka Pipe Line Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

569

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Walter S. Hallanan, State Tax Commissioner, and E. T. England, Attorney General of the State of West Virginia, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The Eureka Pipe Line Company. — In Error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

885

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the

Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Walter S. Hallanan, State Tax Commissioner, and E. T. England, Attorney General, of the State of West Virginia, Petitioners,
570 vs.
United Fuel Gas Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Walter S. Hallanan, State Tax Commissioner, and E. T. England, Attorney General of the State of West Virginia, Plaintiffs in Error,
886 vs.
United Fuel Gas Company.

In Error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Toledo Scale Company, Petitioner,
339 vs.
The Computing Scale Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from

the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland et al., Petitioners,
388 vs.
The Computing Scale Company et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Keller et al., Appellants,
260 vs.
Potomac Electric Power Company.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

Simon Hecht et al., Trustees,
Petitioners,
532 vs.

John F. Malley, Former
Collector of Internal
Revenue.

Arthur L. Howard et al.,
Trustees,
Petitioners,
533 vs.
John F. Malley, Former
Collector of Internal
Revenue.

Arthur L. Howard et al.,
Trustees, Petitioners,
534 vs.
Andrew J. Casey, Former
Acting Collector of
Internal Revenue.

On consideration of the motion to reassign these cases,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and that the cases be reassigned for argument on Monday, April 30th next, as one case, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Railway Company,
Appellant,
756 vs.
A. D. Watts, Individually,
etc., et al.

Atlantic Coast Line Rail-
road Company, Appellant,
724 vs.
A. D. Watts, Commissioner
of Revenue, etc., et al.

Seaboard Air Line Railroad
Company, Appellant,
744 vs.
A. D. Watts, Individually,
etc., et al.

Norfolk Southern Railroad
Company, Appellant,
727 vs.
A. D. Watts, Individually,
etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion to substitute the new Commissioner of Revenue, R. A. Daughton, for the Ex-Commissioner of Revenue, A. D. Watts, as a party appellee herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Complainant,
20, Orig'l. vs.
The State of New York et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a motion to dismiss herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and the cause assigned for argument on the motion to dismiss on April 23d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Superior Water, Light & Power Company, Plaintiff in Error,
436 vs.
City of Superior et al., etc.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company, Petitioner,
877 vs.
Edmund R. Wells et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Nassau Smelting & Refining Works, Petitioner,
897 vs.
Brightwood Bronze Foundry Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert W. Hunt et al., Petitioners,
898 vs.
D. L. Gillespie.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dean Sherry, Trustee in Bankruptcy, etc., et al., etc., Petitioners,
843 vs.
J. B. Lucas.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John W. Talbot, Petitioner,
856 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Window Glass Machine Company, et al., Petitioners,
868 vs.
Pittsburgh Plate Glass Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Pusey and Jones Company,
Petitioner,

Willard Saulsbury et al., as
Receivers, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Herbert W. Baker, Administrator, etc., Petitioner,
882 vs.
John Barton Payne, Director General, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Freiberg Mahogany Company, Petitioner,
891 vs.
The Batesville Lumber & Veneer Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company, Petitioner,
900 vs.
McKinley C. Myers.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition

be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sam M. Saliba et al., Petitioners, On petition for writ of certiorari to
904 vs. the United States Circuit Court of
The United States of America. Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James K. Cochran et al., On consideration of the motion for a stay
Plaintiffs in Error, of the mandate in this cause,
498 vs. It is now here ordered by this Court that
Coulton M. Becker. the said motion be, and the same is hereby,
overruled.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Appellant,
121 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.
Mason & Hanger Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, upon a rehearing, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of this Court, entered in this cause on the 4th day of December, 1922, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Appellant,
122 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.
Northeastern Construction
Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, upon a rehearing, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of this Court, entered in this cause on the 4th day of December, 1922, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The People of the State of New York ex rel. Emeline P. Clyde,
Plaintiff in Error,
318 vs.
State Tax Commission of the State of New York.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner,
172 vs.
Fruit Growers' Express, Inc.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Appellant,
866 vs.
Peninsular Stove Company.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Glen Collins, Appellant,
880 vs.
Victor Loisel, U. S. Marshal, etc.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts,
Complainant,
24, Orig'l. vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury, et al.; and
Harriet O. Frothingham, Appellant,
962 vs.

Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary
of the Treasury, et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf, these cases were advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, April 30th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts,
Complainant,
24, Orig'l. vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of
the Treasury, et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief herein as amicus curiae.

James C. Davis, as Agent,
etc., Plaintiff in Error,
896 vs.
Charles Hereford.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. W. Smith, Mr. Vincent M. Miles, Mr. Thomas B. Pryor, and Mr. A.A. McLaughlin for the plaintiff in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Robert A. Rowe for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

Stefano Sanguinetti,
Appellant,
634 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

The motion to reinstate this cause on the docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin Carter for the appellant in support of the motion.

Magnum Import Company (Inc.),
Petitioner,
978 vs.
Francois Joseph de Spoturno
Coty;
Max L. Cohn, trading as The
MacLen Import Company,
Petitioner,
979 vs.
Francois Joseph de Spoturno
Coty;

Arthur Baum et al., trading as
The Beautex Company,
Petitioners,
980 vs.
Francois Joseph de Spoturno Coty;
Magnum Import Company (Inc.),
Petitioner,
981 vs.
Houbigant (Inc.); and
Ivory Novelties Trading Company
(Inc.), Petitioner,
982 vs.
Francois Joseph de Spoturno Coty.

The motion for stay in these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Tuttle for the petitioners.

George F. Shafer, as Attorney General of the State of North Dakota, et al., Appellants,
958 vs.
Farmers Grain Company of Emmden, et al.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Karl Knox Gartner in that behalf.

Puget Sound Power & Light Company,
Petitioner,
905 vs.
City of Seattle et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney and Mr. James B. Howe for the petitioner, and by Mr. Walter B. Beals and Mr. Robert H. Evans for the respondents.

Frederick M. Dyer et al.,
Petitioners,
977 vs.
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The motion for a stay, and for bail, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Philip N. Jones for the petitioners.

First National Bank in St. Louis,
Plaintiff in Error,
919 vs.
The State of Missouri at the information of Jesse W. Barrett, Attorney

The petition for a writ of certiorari, motion to advance, and motion for a stay herein, were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Otto Kahlenbeck in behalf of

James C. Jones, Mr. Frank H. Sullivan, and Mr. Lon O. Hocker for the petitioner, and by Mr. Jesse W. Barrett, Mr. Merrill E. Otis, Mr. Sam B. Jeffries, Mr. William T. Jones, Mr. Harold H. Small, Mr. Marion S. Early, and Mr. Edward W. Forstel for the defendant in error, in opposition thereto.

T. J. Bell, Petitioner,
873 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jed C. Adams and Mr. W. B. Harrell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

United Leather Workers' International Union No. 66, et al.,
Appellants,
878 vs.
Herkert & Meisel Trunk Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John P. Leahy for the petitioner.

Cosho Company (Inc.),
Petitioner,
885 vs.
Southern Pacific Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. W. Flournoy for the petitioner, and by Mr. C. F. R. Ogilby and Mr. William F. Herrin for the respondent.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, Agent,
Petitioner,
890 vs.
Michael J. Hanlon.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas Patterson for the petitioner.

Vulcanite Roofing Company, (Inc.),
Petitioner,
893 vs.
Commonwealth Steamship Company (Limited).

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Oscar R. Houston, Mr. D. Roger Englar, and Mr. Henry H. Little for the petitioner, and by Mr. John M. Woolsey and Mr. Edward R. Baird, Jr., for the respondent.

Brown-Crummer Company,
Petitioner,
894 vs.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Oscar O'Neill Touchstone for the

petitioner, and by Mr. Francis M. Etheridge, Mr. Joseph M. McCormick, and Mr. Snowden M. Leftwich for the respondent.

Charles E. Albury, Petitioner,
899 vs.
Benjamin E. Dyson, U. S. Marshal, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. J. Barco and Mr. Harry Hawkins for the petitioner.

M. McGirr's Sons Company, Petitioner,
908 vs.
Pennsylvania Railroad Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Vance Hewitt for the petitioner, and by Mr. Chauncey I. Clark for the respondents.

Harley Davidson Motor Company et al., Petitioners,
909 vs.
Eclipse Machine Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Melville Church, Mr. William S. Hodges, and Mr. Edwin B. H. Tower, Jr., for the petitioners, and by Mr. Charles L. Sturtevant and Mr. Archibald Cox for the respondents.

Orlando Lee Cleveland, Petitioner,
914 vs.
Robert Mattingly, Judge, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. Morris Wampler for the petitioner.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads and Agent, etc., Petitioner,
913 vs.
Robert B. Caldwell.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Homer Hall, Mr. A. A. McLaughlin, and Mr. N. S. Brown for the petitioner, and by Mr. John G. Parkinson for the respondent.

Thomas Hammerschmidt et al., Petitioners,
924 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph W. Sharts for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Central Union Trust Company of New York, Petitioner,

929 vs.
William H. Edwards, as Collector, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John M. Perry and Mr. Arthur H. Van Brunt for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Duncan Beaton, Petitioner,
965 vs.
Duluth, Winnipeg & Pacific Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick M. Miner for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. D. Bailey, Mr. Oscar Mitchell and Mr. A. C. Gillette for the respondent.

Guno H. Rudolph et al., Commissioners, etc., Petitioners,
969 vs.
Charles E. Hunt et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. H. Stephens, Mr. R. L. Williams, and Mr. George P. Barse for the petitioners.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Appellant,
683 vs.
A. D. Watts, etc., Commissioner of Revenue.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of North Carolina.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Appellant,
684 vs.
A. D. Watts, etc., Commissioner of Revenue.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of North Carolina.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Norfolk Southern Railroad Company, Appellant,
688 vs.
A. D. Watts, Commissioner of Revenue.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of North Carolina.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Victor Raymond Hammer, Plaintiff in Error,
367 vs.
The United States of America.

This case was submitted by Mr. Will R. King for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim, and Mr. Clifford H. Byrnes for the defendant in error.

Charles I. Stager, Appellant,
370 vs.
The United States.

This case was submitted by Mr. Edwin R. Wakefield for the appellant, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Lovett for the appellee.

Curtis, Collins & Holbrook Company, Appellant,
341 to 364, inclusive. vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Charles A. Shurtleff for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, April 10th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry E. Davis, it is ordered that Leven H. Ellis, Esquire, of Columbiana, State of Alabama; and Eugene D. O'Sullivan, Esquire, and Charles J. Southard, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stephen W. Williams, it is ordered that W. P. Z. German, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Ellen S. Massey, it is ordered that Olive M. Jack, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, andshe was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A.Wheat, it is ordered that George H. Carter, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank E. Scott, it is ordered that W. Yale Smiley, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this

Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States, Plaintiff in Error,
316 vs.
New River Collieries Company.

On motion of Mr. Ira J. Williams for the defendant in error, leave was granted to file additional brief herein.

Curtis, Collins & Holbrook Company, Appellant,
341 to 364, inclusive. vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Charles A. Shurtleff for the appellant, and concluded by Mr. S. W. Williams for the appellee.

Houston Coal Company, Plaintiff in Error,
365 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. A. J. Freiberg for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Ira Jewell Williams for the plaintiff in error.

J. A. Campbell, Plaintiff in Error,
366 vs.
The State of North Carolina.

This case was submitted by Mr. Theodore F. Davidson and Mr. Louis M. Bourne for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. James S. Manning for the defendant in error.

The United States, Appellant,
371 vs.
Harry W. Luskey;
The United States, Appellant,
372 vs.
John B. Mossel; and
The United States, Appellant,
373 vs.
Charles F. Milford.

These cases were argued by Mr. James A. Fowler for the appellant, and by Mr. George A. King for the appellees.

A. G. Spalding & Bros., Plaintiff in Error,
710 vs.
William H. Edwards, Collector, etc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, April 11th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., it is ordered that Ransford W. Shaw, Esquire, of Houlton, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, it is ordered that John G. Logue, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Frederick M. Dyer et al.,
Petitioners,
977 vs.
Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the motion for stay of execution and for bail, pending petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, as premature.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Magnum Import Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
978 vs.
Francois Joseph de Spoturno
Coty.
Max L. Cohn, trading as The
Maclen Import Company.

979 vs.

Francois Joseph de Spoturno Coty.

Arthur Baum and Ruth Baum, trading as The Beautex Company, Petitioner,

980 vs.

Francois Joseph de Spoturno Coty.

Magnum Import Company, Petitioner,

981 vs.

Houbigant, Inc.

Ivory Novelties Trading Company, Petitioner,

982 vs.

Francois Joseph de Spoturno Coty.

Upon consideration of the annexed petitions of the Magnum Import Company, Inc., Max L. Cohn, trading as The Maclen Import Company, Arthur Baum and Ruth Baum, trading as The Beautex Company, and Ivory Novelties Trading Company, and the annexed affidavit of Ned Schoenbrum, verified April 7, 1923, and pending the petitions herein for writs of certiorari filed in this Court on April 9, 1923,

It is hereby ordered that the respondents show cause before this Court on Monday, April 16th next, at twelve o'clock noon, or as soon thereafter as counsel may be heard, why writs of supersedeas or orders suspending the injunctions granted below should not be made and the petitioners have such other and further relief as may be just, pending further determination by this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. G. Spalding & Bros.,
Plaintiff in Error,
710 vs.
William H. Edwards, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., for the plaintiff in error, by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., for the plaintiff in error.

Thomas D. McCarthy, United States Marshal, Appellant,
404 vs.
Jules W. Arndstein.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Saul S. Myers for the appellant, continued by Mr. W. J. Fallon for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Walter H. Pollak for the appellant.

The Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway et al.,
Appellants,
396 vs.
The State of Tennessee et al., etc., et al.; and
The United States, Appellant,
429 vs.
The State of Tennessee et al.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the United States; continued by Mr. J. Carter Fort for the Interstate Commerce Commission, by Mr. William H. Swiggart, Jr., for the appellees, and by Mr. Fitzgerald Hall for the Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, April 12th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. V. Cushman, it is ordered that Charles S. Grover, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Michael A. Mattigan, it is ordered that David J. Howell, Esquire, D. Avery Haggard, Esquire, and Ray E. Lee, Esquire, of Cheyenne, State of Wyoming, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., it is ordered that Daniel G. Donoghue, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George M. Morris, it is ordered that Leo H. Hoffman, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stiles W. Burr, it is ordered that Morton Barrows, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he

was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Gardiner Lathrop, it is ordered that William T. Farley, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway et al., Appellants,
396 vs.
The State of Tennessee et al., etc., et al.: and
The United States, Appellant,
429 vs.
The State of Tennessee et al.

The argument of these cases was concluded by Mr. Fitzgerald Hall for The Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway et al.

Benjamin Gitlow, Plaintiff in Error,
770 vs.
The People of the State of New York.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. W. H. Pollak for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. Walter Nelles for the plaintiff in error; by Mr. W. J. Wetherbee for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. John Caldwell Myers for the defendant in error.

David H. Riddle, Appellant,
663 vs.
James E. Dyche, Warden, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. Henry E. Davis for the appellant and by Mr. Rufus S. Day for the appellee.

Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, et al., Appellants,
288 vs.
The United States ex rel. McAllister-Edwards Coal Company.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. H. L. Underwood for the appellants, continued by Mr. George M. Porter for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Conrad H. Syme for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, April 15th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E. Chamberlain, it is ordered that Ray S. Fellows, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Ex parte in the matter of Adolph Palasis, Petitioner.
---, Original.

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Barnett H. Kopelman and Mr. Joseph G. M. Browne for the petitioner.

The First National Bank of San Jose, Plaintiff in Error,
276 vs.
The State of California et al.

This case was submitted by Mr. S. F. Leib for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. U. S. Webb for the defendants in error.

Frederick Wesche, Appellant,
292 vs.
Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian;

Commercial Trust Company of New Jersey, Appellant,
575 vs.
Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property

Charles J. Ahrenfeldt,
Appellant,
576 vs.
Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian.

The death of Frederick Wesche was suggested; and United States Trust Company of New York, as ancillary administrator of the estate of the said Frederick Wesche, deceased, was substituted as the party appellant in No. 292, on motion of Mr. Selden Bacon in that behalf.

The argument was commenced by Mr. Selden Bacon for the appellants, continued by Mr. James A. Fowler for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Selden Bacon for the appellants.

King County, Washington, Appellant,
515 vs.
Seattle School District No. 1.

This case was argued by Mr. Howard A. Hanson for the appellant, and by Mr. Henry W. Pennock for the appellee.

William R. Begg et al.,
Receivers, etc., Appellants,
6 vs.
The City of New York et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Lindley M. Garrison for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, April 16th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that Joseph T. Zottoli, Esquire, of Boston, and William J. White, Jr., Esquire, of Lowell, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Theodore K. Bryant, it is ordered that Isidor Enselman, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin C. Brandenburg, it is ordered that Louis M. Denit, Esquire, George H. Paltridge, Esquire, and Charles A. Lind, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. C. Carlin, it is ordered that M. Carter Hall, Esquire, of Fairfax, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Mark Ash, it is ordered that Edward Ash, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice

as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. Catesby Jones, it is ordered that George V. A. McCloskey, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lindley M. Garrison, it is ordered that Raoul E. Desvernine, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletcher, it is ordered that John C. Gramling, Esquire, of Miami, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert Ottinger, it is ordered that Hugh W. Davis, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, and George Calvert Bowie, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank S. Bright, it is ordered that Henry D. Bushnell, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Davis, it is ordered that Charles C. Crabbe, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Howell Green, it is ordered that Frank Harwell, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Tuttle, it is ordered that Isaac Beiss, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he

was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas G. Bradley, it is ordered that W. Blodgett Priest, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh T. Gordon, Jr., it is ordered that Paul Vallee, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William B. Jaynes, it is ordered that William E. Fitzgerald, Esquire, of Wichita Falls, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

William A. Prendergast et al., constituting the Public Service Commission of the State of New York, et al., Appellants,
542 vs.
New York Telephone Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Board of Trade of the City of Chicago, John Hill, Jr., Reuben G. Chandler, et al., Appellants,
701 vs.
Charles F. Clyne, United States District Attorney for the Northern District of Illinois; Henry C. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture,

and Arthur C. Lueder, United
States Postmaster at the City
of Chicago.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds,
Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

Lehigh & Hudson River Railway Company, Petitioner,
805 vs.
Florence M. Otterstedt, on behalf of herself and minor children.

On consideration of the petition for a rehearing herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Glenn Collins, Appellant,
880 vs.
Victor Loisel, United States Marshal, etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 30th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George P. Shafer, as Attorney General of the State of North Dakota, et al., Appellants,
958 vs.
Farmers Grain Company of Embden

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 30th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft

First National Bank in St. Louis, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Missouri at the information of Jesse W. Barrett, Attorney General. 919

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 30th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

First National Bank in St. Louis, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Missouri at the information of Jesse W. Barrett, Attorney General. 919

On consideration of the motion for a stay herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted with respect to the branch bank now in operation, but in all other respects denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Stefano Sanguinetti, Appellant, vs. The United States. 684

On consideration of the motion to reinstate this case to the docket,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of Adolph Palcais, Petitioner. ---, Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, without prejudice to an application to the District Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas Hammerschmidt et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 924

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the

said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gosho Company, Inc., Petitioner, vs. Southern Pacific Company. 883

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, Agent, Petitioner, vs. Michael J. Hanlon. 890

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Vulcanite Roofing Company, Petitioner, vs. Commonwealth Steamship Company. 893

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Brown-Crummer Company, Petitioner, vs. W. M. Rice Construction Company. 894

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the

argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Puget Sound Power & Light Company, Petitioner, vs. City of Seattle et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

905

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

M. McGirr's Sons Company, Petitioner, vs. Pennsylvania Railroad Company et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

908

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harley-Davidson Motor Company et al., Petitioners, vs. Eclipse Machine Company et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

909

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, etc., Petitioner, vs. Robert B. Caldwell. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

913

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon

had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Orlando Lee Cleveland, Petitioner, vs. Robert Mattingly, Judge, etc.
914

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Central Union Trust Company of New York, Petitioner, vs. William H. Edwards, as Collector, etc.
929

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Duncan Beaton, Petitioner, vs. Duluth, Winnipeg & Pacific Railway Company.
865

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cuno H. Rudolph et al., Commissioners, etc., Petitioners,

969 vs.
Charles E. Hunt et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United Leather Workers International Union No. 66 et al., Appellants,
878 vs.
Herbert & Meisel Trunk Company et al.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the case on the appeal.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

First National Bank in St. Louis, Plaintiff in Error,
919 vs.
The State of Missouri at the information of Jesse W. Barrett, Attorney General.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the case on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Victor Raymond Hammaer, Plaintiff in Error,
367 vs.
The United States of America.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles I. Stager, Appellant,
370 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. A. Campbell, Plaintiff in Error,
366 vs.
The State of North Carolina.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jay Burns Baking Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
522 vs.
Samuel R. McKelvie, as Governor of the State of Nebraska, et al.

On consideration of the motion to substitute the new Governor, Charles W. Bryan, for the Ex-Governor, Samuel R. McKelvie; and to substitute the new Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, Grant Shumway, for the Ex-Secretary, Leo E. Stuhr,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, on the ground that such substitution is authorized by Section 8546, Comp.Stats. Nebr., 1922, as construed and applied by the Supreme Court of Nebraska.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas D. McCarthy, United States Marshal, Appellant,
404 vs.
Jules W. Arndstein.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellant, leave was granted to file supplemental brief herein.

Eugene Schaefer et al., Trustees, etc., Appellants,
456 vs.

Thomas W. Miller, as Alien
Property Custodian of the
United States.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. James M. Beck, in behalf of counsel for the appellants, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry H. Weiss, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
935 vs.
Louis Stearn.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John C. Hayes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles P. Hine for the respondent.

Harry H. Weiss, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
936 vs.
John G. White.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John C. Hayes for the petitioner, and by Mr. John G. White, Mr. A. V. Cannon, and Mr. W. H. Annat for the respondent.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
307 vs.
American Linseed Oil Company et al.

On motion of Mr. William J. Matthews in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief herein as amicus curiae.

Ex parte in the matter of James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, etc., Petitioner.
27, Original.

The motion of Mr. J. M. Woolsey for leave to file brief herein as amicus curiae was denied.

Max Hart, Appellant,
765 vs.
B. F. Keith Vaudeville Exchange, Orpheum Circuit (Inc.), et al.

On motion of Mr. Louis B. Eppstein in that behalf, this cause was reassigned for argument.

The Young Men's Christian Association of Columbus, Ohio, et al., Petitioners,
915 vs.
Ora Davis, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., Mr. Henry A. Williams, Mr. Guy W. Mallon, and Mr. James I. Boulger for the petitioners, and by Mr. Arthur I. Vorys for the respondents.

Francisco Bianchi et al., Appellants,
934 vs.
Manuel Mendia Morales et al.

The motion to affirm or advance, and to vacate stay, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. G. Walter for the appellees in support of the motion, and by Mr. Phelan Beale for the appellants in opposition thereto.

Jeanette L. MacKelvie, Petitioner,
971 vs.
The Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Company of Newark, New Jersey.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Wallace, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, Jr., for the respondent.

Railroad Commission of the State of California, Petitioner,
984 vs.
Southern Pacific Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hugh Gordon for the petitioner, and by Mr. C. W. Durbrow, Mr. E. W. Camp, Mr. A. S. Halsted, and Mr. Charles H. Bates for the respondents.

Railroad Commission of the State of California, Petitioner,
985 vs.
The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hugh Gordon for the petitioner, and by Mr. C. W. Durbrow, Mr. E. W. Camp, Mr. A. S. Halsted, and Mr. Charles H. Bates for the respondent.

Railroad Commission of the State of California, Petitioner,
986 vs.
Los Angeles & Salt Lake Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hugh Gordon for the petitioner, and by Mr. C. W. Durbrow, Mr. E. W. Camp, Mr. A. S. Halsted, and Mr. Charles H. Bates for the respondent.

New York Life Insurance Company, Petitioner,
920 vs.
Marion C. Slocomb.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis H. Cooke for the petitioner, and by Mr. Arthur E. Griffin for the respondent.

New York Life Insurance Company, Petitioner,
921 vs.
Grace G. Rutherford.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis H. Cooke for the petitioner.

La Verra M. McNulty, by C. H. McNulty, her next friend, Petitioner,
930 vs.
The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry E. Lutz for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank A. Kemp, Jr., and Mr. Gardiner Lathrop for the respondent.

Robert W. Hunt et al., Petitioners,
937 vs.
George H. Clapp.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horace G. Stone and Mr. Louis G. Richardson for the petitioners, and by Mr. David A. Reed and Mr. George H. Calvert for the respondent.

Robert W. Hunt et al., Petitioners,
938 vs.
Ralph W. Harbison.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horace G. Stone and Mr. Louis G. Richardson for the petitioners, and by Mr. David A. Reed and Mr. George H. Calvert for the respondent.

Robert W. Hunt et al.,
Petitioners,
939 vs.
Mary L. Henry, Executrix, etc.
for the respondent.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horace G. Stone and Mr. Louis G. Richardson for the petitioners, and by Mr. David A. Reed and Mr. George H. Calvert

Robert W. Hunt et al.,
Petitioners,
940 vs.
George H. Calvert.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horace G. Stone and Mr. Louis G. Richardson for the petitioners, and by Mr. David A. Reed and Mr. George H. Calvert for the respondent.

Robert W. Hunt et al.,
Petitioners,
941 vs.
Harry S. Calvert.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horace G. Stone and Mr. Louis G. Richardson for the petitioners, and by Mr. David A. Reed and Mr. George H. Calvert for the respondent.

Robert W. Hunt et al.,
Petitioners,
942 vs.
George H. Theiss, Surviving Executor, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horace G. Stone and Mr. Louis G. Richardson for the petitioners, and by Mr. David A. Reed and Mr. George H. Calvert for the respondent.

Robert W. Hunt et al.,
Petitioners,
943 vs.
D. F. Collingwood.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horace G. Stone and Mr. Louis G. Richardson for the petitioners, and by Mr. David A. Reed and Mr. George H. Calvert for the respondent.

Robert W. Hunt et al.,
Petitioners,
944 vs.
E. W. Gwinner.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horace G. Stone and Mr. Louis G. Richardson for the petitioners, and by Mr. David A. Reed and Mr. George H. Calvert for the respondent.

Robert W. Hunt et al.,
Petitioners,

945 vs.

R. B. Montgomery.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horace G. Stone and Mr. Louis G. Richardson for the petitioners, and by Mr. David A. Reed and Mr. George H. Calvert for the respondent.

Robert W. Hunt et al., Petitioners,
946 vs.
George N. Glass.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horace G. Stone and Mr. Louis G. Richardson for the petitioners, and by Mr. David A. Reed and Mr. George H. Calvert for the respondent.

Robert W. Hunt et al., Petitioners,
947 vs.
W. A. Harbison.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horace G. Stone and Mr. Louis G. Richardson for the petitioners, and by Mr. David A. Reed and Mr. George H. Calvert for the respondent.

Walker Grain Company, Bankrupts, et al., Petitioners,
949 vs.
Gregg Grain Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bernard Titche for the petitioners, and by Mr. Mark McMahon for the respondents.

Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company, Petitioner,
953 vs.
O. J. Nichols.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward W. Camp, Mr. Robert O. Brennan, Mr. Gardiner Lathrop, and Mr. Paul Burks for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lyndel L. Young for the respondent.

Jacob Goldman, Receiver, etc., Petitioner,
998 vs.
Frank M. McKey, Trustee.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lewis F. Jacobson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederick D. Silber and Mr. Clarence J. Silber for the respondent.

William R. Begg et al.,
Receivers, Appellants,
6 vs.
The City of New York et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Vincent Victory for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Lindley M. Garrison for the appellants.

Ex parte in the matter of
James C. Davis, Director
General of Railroads, etc.,
Petitioner.
27, Original.

This cause was argued on the return to the rule to show cause by Mr. T. Catesby Jones for the petitioner, and by Mr. Mark Ash for the respondent; with leave to counsel for both sides to file briefs on or before Thursday next.

Magnum Import Company (Inc.),
Petitioner,
978 vs.
Francois Joseph de Spoturno
Coty;
Max L. Cohn, trading as The
Maclen Import Company (Inc.),
Petitioner,
979 vs.
Francois Joseph de Spoturno
Coty;
Arthur Baum et al.,trading as
The Beautex Company,
Petitioner,
980 vs.
Francois Joseph de Spoturno
Coty;
Magnum Import Company (Inc.),
Petitioner,
981 vs.
Houbigant (Inc.); and
Ivory Novelties Trading Company
(Inc.), Petitioner,
982 vs.

Francois Joseph de Spoturno

Coty.

The argument on the return to the rule to show cause herein was commenced by Mr. Charles H. Tuttle for the petitioners.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, April 17th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George F. Snyder, it is ordered that Irving I. Goldsmith, Esquire, of Saratoga Springs, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert H. Lovett, it is ordered that Thomas H. Creighton, Esquire, of Fairfield, Rudolph J. Kremer, Esquire, of East St. Louis, and Philip W. Barnes, Esquire, of Lawrenceville, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Homer W. Davis, it is ordered that Andrew Logan Anderson, Esquire, of Lincoln, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. White, Jr., it is ordered that Harold Cowerly, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rome G. Brown, it is ordered that Edwin C. Brown, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and

he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stanley H. Fischer, it is ordered that Herbert J. Jacobi, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. Riter, it is ordered that Richard E. Leach, Esquire, and Stanley T. Wallbank, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Magnum Import Company (Inc.),
Petitioner,
978 vs.
Francois Joseph de Spoturno Coty;
Max L. Cohn, trading as The Maclen Import Company (Inc.), Petitioner,
979 vs.
Francois Joseph de Spoturno Coty;
Arthur Bamm et al., trading as The Beantex Company, Petitioner,
980 vs.
Francois Joseph de Spoturno Coty;
Magnum Import Company (Inc.),
Petitioner,
981 vs.
Houbigant (Inc.); and
Ivory Novelties Trading Company (Inc.), Petitioner,
982 vs.
Francois Joseph de Spoturno Coty.

The argument on the return to the rule to show cause herein was continued by Mr. Charles H. Tuttle for the petitioners, by Mr. Asher Blum for the respondent Coty, and concluded by Mr. George S. Hornblower for Houbigant (Inc.).

Magnum Import Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
978 vs.
Francois Joseph de Spoturno Coty.
Max L. Cohn, trading as The Maclen Import Company, Inc., Petitioner,

979 vs.
Francois Joseph de Spoturno
Coty.
Arthur Baum et al., trading
as The Bomtex Company,
Petitioner,
980 vs.
Francois Joseph de Spoturno
Coty.
Magnum Import Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
981 vs.
Houbigant, Inc.

Ivory Novelties Trading
Company, Inc., Petitioner,
982 vs.
Francois Joseph de Spoturno
Coty.

On consideration of the petitions for suspending orders herein, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petitions be, and the same are hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pacific Gas & Electric
Company, Appellant,
331 vs.
City and County of San
Francisco;
Pacific Gas & Electric
Company, Appellant,
332 vs.
City and County of San
Francisco, et al.; and
Pacific Gas & Electric
Company, Appellant,
333 vs.

City and County of San Francisco, et al.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Louis Titus for the appellant, continued by Mr. R. M. Searles for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. W. B. Bosley for the appellant.

The People of the State of New York ex rel. Emeline F. Clyde, Plaintiff in Error,
318 vs.
John P. Gilbert, President, etc., et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Arthur E. Goddard for the plaintiff in error, and case submitted by Mr. Francis W. Cullen, Mr. James S. Y. Ivins, and Mr. C. T. Dawes for the defendants in error.

Elmore D. Dier et al., Appellants,
330 vs.
Joab H. Banton, District Attorney, etc., et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Nash Rockwood for the appellants. The court declined to hear further argument.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, etc., Plaintiff in Error,
270 vs.
Farmers' Cooperative Equity Company.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Gardiner Lathrop for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Gardiner Lathrop, it is ordered that George O. Wilson, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lindsay L. Thompson, it is ordered that John H. Powell, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company, Appellant, vs. Railroad Commission of Georgia et al. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

384

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed.

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Director

General of Railroads, etc.,

Plaintiff in Error,

270 vs.

Farmers' Cooperative Equity Company.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Gardiner Lathrop for the plaintiff in error, by Mr. Morton Barrows for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. H. W. Davis for the plaintiff in error.

Arthur W. Ide et al., Appellants,
334 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. D. A. Haggard for the appellants, continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Riter for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Ray H. Lee for the appellants.

Brush Electric Company, Appellant,
179 vs.
City of Galveston et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. William H. Armbrecht for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, April 19th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George A. King, it is ordered that Harry H. Mead, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James Walton, it is ordered that Roy Herald, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul A. Walker, it is ordered that H. D. Driscoll, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, and Elmer Thomas, Esquire, of Lawton, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Brush Electric Company,
Appellant,
179 vs.
City of Galveston et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. William H. Armbrecht for the appellant, by Mr. James W. Wayman for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. William H. Armbrecht for the appellant.

American Steel Foundries,
Appellant,
291 vs.

Thomas E. Robertson, Commissioner of Patents, etc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. George L. Wilkinson for the appellant, continued by Mr. Nathan Heard for the Simplex Electric Heating Company, one of the appellees, and concluded by Mr. George L. Wilkinson for the appellant.

Joslin Manufacturing Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
219 vs.
Walter L. Clarke, City Treasurer, etc.;
Scituate Light & Power Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
220 vs.
City of Providence et al.; and
Theresa B. Joslin, Plaintiff in Error,
221 vs.
City of Providence et al.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Robert H. McCarter for the plaintiffs in error, continued by Mr. Albert A. Baker for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, April 20th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford.
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis Marshall, it is ordered that Benjamin F. Feiner, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E. Alter, it is ordered that Sterling G. McNees, Esquire, of Harrisburg, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. Butler Moulton, it is ordered that Frank P. Mason, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Armond W. Scott, it is ordered that George W. Blackwell, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John M. Woolsey, it is ordered that Frank P. Dresser, Esquire, of Worcester, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James B. Howe, it is ordered that Walter B. Allen, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

W. T. Campbell, Plaintiff in Error,
266 vs.
The City of Olney.

This case was submitted by Mr. A. H. Carrigan for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. W. B. Jaynes for the defendant in error.

Joslin Manufacturing Company, Plaintiff in Error,
219 vs.
Walter I. Clarke, City Treasurer, etc.;
Scituate Light & Power Company, Plaintiff in Error,
220 vs.
City of Providence et al.; and
Theresa B. Joslin, Plaintiff in Error,
221 vs.
City of Providence et al.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. A. A. Baker for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. Robert H. McCarter for the plaintiffs in error. Leave was granted counsel for the plaintiffs in error to file an additional brief.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Complainant,
15, Orig'l. vs.
State of West Virginia; and
State of Ohio, Complainant,
16, Orig'l. vs.
State of West Virginia.

The reargument of these cases was commenced by Mr. John W. Davis for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of Ohio, continued by Mr. G. M. Hoffheimer for the State of West Virginia, and concluded by Mr. George E. Alter for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, April 28rd, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Warren, it is ordered that William O. Reeder, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that Arthur R. Smiley, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Caldwell Myers, it is ordered that Jesb H. Banton, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rush L. Holland, it is ordered that Norman Stanley Case, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chester I. Long, it is ordered that Charles B. Griffith, Esquire, and Randal C. Harvey, Esquire, of Topeka, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John S. Dean, it is ordered that Harry W. Colmery, Esquire, of Topeka, State of Kansas, and Fred C. Huebner, Esquire, of Albia, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander W. Smith, it is ordered that John J. Parker, Esquire, of Charlotte, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company, Appellant, vs. The United States. 184

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Lion Bonding & Surety Company, Petitioner, vs. A. H. Karatz. 574

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota with directions to dismiss the bill.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Department of Trade and Commerce of the State of Nebraska et al., Petitioners,

467 vs.

A. J. Herts et al., as
Receivers of the Lien
Bonding and Surety Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska with directions to dismiss the bill.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

A. G. Spalding & Brothers, Plaintiff in Error, — In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

710 vs.

William H. Edwards, Collector
of Internal Revenue for the
Second District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Commercial Trust Company of
New Jersey, Appellant,

575 vs.

Thomas W. Miller, as Alien

Property Custodian.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

United States Trust Company of New York, as Ancillary Administrator of Frederick Weschc, deceased, Appellant,

292 vs.

Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Charles J. Ahrenfeldt, Appellant,

576 vs.

Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and

that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The United States, Appellant,
371 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.
Harry W. Luskey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The United States, Appellant,
372 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.
John B. Mossel.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The United States, Appellant,
373 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.
Charles F. Milford.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Harry H. Weiss, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
935 vs. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.
Louis Stearn.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to

the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry H. Weiss, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, 936 vs. John G. White.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company, Petitioner, 953 vs O. J. Nichols.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Railroad Commission of the State of California, Petitioner, 984 vs. Southern Pacific Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State ofCalifornia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Railroad Commission of the State of California, Petitioner, 985 vs. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Railroad Commission of the State of California, Petitioner.
986 vs.
Los Angeles & Salt Lake Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jacob Goldman et al., Receivers, etc., Petitioners,
998 vs.
Frank M. McKey, Trustee, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

T. J. Bell, Petitioner,
873 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, as Agent, etc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
896 vs.

Charles Hareford.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Young Men's Christian Association of Columbus, Ohio, et al., Petitioners, vs. Ora Davis et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

915

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Life Insurance Company, Petitioner, vs. Marion C. Slocomb. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

920

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Life Insurance Company, Petitioner, vs. Grace G. Rutherford. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

921

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Le Verra M. McNulty, by C. E. McNulty, her next friend, Petitioner,
930 vs.
The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert W. Hunt et al., Petitioners,
937 vs.
George H. Clapp.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert W. Hunt et al., Petitioners,
938 vs.
Ralph W. Harbison.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert W. Hunt et al., Petitioners,
939 vs.
Mary L. Henry, Executrix, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the

Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert W. Hunt et al., Petitioners, vs. George H. Calvert. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

940

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert W. Hunt et al., Petitioners, vs. Harry S. Calvert. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

941

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert W. Hunt et al., Petitioners, vs. George H. Theiss, Surviving Executor of the Will of George W. Theiss, deceased. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

942

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert W. Hunt et al., Petitioners, vs. D. F. Collingwood. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

945

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel

thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert W. Hunt et al., Petitioners, vs. E. W. Gwinner. 944

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert W. Hunt et al., Petitioners, vs. R. B. Montgomery. 945

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert W. Hunt et al., Petitioners, vs. George H. Glass. 946

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert W. Hunt et al., Petitioners, vs. W. A. Harbison. 947

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to

the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Walker Grain Company, Bankrupts, et al., Petitioners, vs. Gregg Grain Company et al. 949 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jeanette L. MacKelvie, Petitioner, vs. The Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Company of Newark, New Jersey. 971 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Emanuel Bookbinder, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 990 — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. Mitchell Palmer and Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Ray Levinson, Petitioner, vs. William A. Greene, Trustee, etc. 1023 — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter B. Allen for the petitioner, with leave to counsel for the respondent to file brief in opposition within ten days.

Manhattan Investment Company, Petitioner.
1024 vs.
William A. Greene, Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter B. Allen for the petitioner, with leave to counsel for the respondent to file brief in opposition within ten days.

The State of Arkansas, Complainant,
21, Orig'l. vs.
The State of Mississippi.

On motion of Mr. Otto Schlobohm in that behalf, leave was granted to file answer to bill of complaint herein.

Alvah Crocker et al., Trustees, Petitioners,
587 vs.
John F. Malley, Collector.

On motion of Mr. Spencer Gordon in that behalf, this case was advanced and assigned for argument with cases Nos. 532, 533 and 534.

Ex parte in the matter of Tanbel-Scott-Kitzmiller Company, Petitioner.
---, Original.

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of prohibition herein was submitted by Mr. Frank J. Hogan for the petitioner.

Adams Express Company, Plaintiff in Error,
865 vs.
W. W. Darden.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William L. Granbery for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition, and by Mr. J. S. Laurent, Mr. K. T. McConnico, and Mr. John A. Pitts for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

The Bromwell Brush & Wire Goods Company, Plaintiff in Error,
887 vs.
The State Board of Charities and Corrections of Kentucky.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harvey Myers for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition.

Ike Windsor, Petitioner,
922 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Gordon for the petitioner.

United States Fidelity &

Guaranty Company, Petitioner,
959 vs.
Robert S. Blake, a Minor, by Grace Twiggs Blake, his Guardian.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Maurice McMicken and Mr. Joseph A. McCullough for the petitioner.

United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company, Petitioner,
960 vs.
Grace Twiggs Blake.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Maurice McMicken and Mr. Joseph A. McCullough for the petitioner.

New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk Telegraph Company, Plaintiff in Error,
972 vs.
John I. Dolan, Collector of Taxes, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William C. Fitts, Mr. Horace Greeley Eastburn, and Mr. Overton Harris for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition.

The I. T. S. Rubber Company, Petitioner,
975 vs.
United States Rubber Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Brown for the petitioner, and by Mr. Livingston Gifford and Mr. Charles S. Jones for the respondent.

Galveston Causeway Construction Company et al., Petitioners,
995 vs.
Galveston, Harrisburg & San Antonio Railway Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Presley K. Ewing, Mr. Wilmer S. Hunt, and Mr. Joseph A. McCullough for the petitioner.

James C. Davis, Agent, Plaintiff in Error,
999 vs.
George D. Henderson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. A. McLaughlin, Mr. Thomas B. Pryor, and Mr. Vincent M. Miles for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition.

Thomas Agnello et al., Petitioners,
1003 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Gordon Battle for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the respondent.

Lehigh & Hudson River Railway Company, Petitioner,
805 vs.
Florence M. Otterstedt, on behalf of herself and minor children.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was re-submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John J. Beattie for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. Clarence Aiken for the respondent.

Raton Water Works Company, Appellant.
293 vs.
The City of Raton.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Mexico.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
76 vs.
Wesley L. Sischo.

This case was reargued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the petitioner, and by Mr. John M. Woolsey for the respondent.

U. S. Webb, as Attorney General of the State of California, et al., Appellants,
267 vs.
J. J. O'Brien et al.;
W. I. Porterfield et al., Appellants,
299 vs.
U. S. Webb, Attorney General

of the State of California, et al.;

Frank Terrace et al., Appellants,

302 vs.

Lindsay L. Thompson, Attorney

General of the State of Washington;

and

Raymond L. Frick et al., Appellants,

555 vs.

U. S. Webb, as Attorney General of

the State of California, et al.

On motion of Mr. Louis Marshall in that behalf, four hours were allowed for the argument of these cases. The argument was commenced by Mr. Louis Marshall for the appellees in No. 267, and for the appellants in Nos. 299 and 555; continued by Mr. U. S. Webb for the appellants in No. 267, and the appellees in Nos. 299 and 555.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, April 24th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Ellen S. Mussey, it is ordered that Anna A. O'Neill and Hope K. Thompson, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William P. Bynum, it is ordered that George H. Brown, Esquire, of Washington, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

U. S. Webb, Attorney General,
etc., et al., Appellants,
267 vs.
J. J. O'Brien et al.;
W. I. Porterfield et al.,
Appellants,
299 vs.
U. S. Webb, as Attorney
General, etc.;
Frank Terrace et al., etc.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
302 vs.
Lindsay L. Thompson, Attorney

General, etc.;

and

Raymond L. Frick et al.,

Appellants,

555 vs.

U. S. Webb, as Attorney General,

etc., et al.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. U. S. Webb for the appellants in No. 267 and for the appellees in Nos. 299 and 555; continued by Mr. James B. Howe for the appellants in No. 302; continued by Mr. L. L. Thompson for the appellee in No. 302, and concluded by Mr. Louis Marshall for the appellees in No. 267 and the appellants in Nos. 299 and 555.

Georgia Railway & Power Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,

463 vs.

The Town of Decatur; and

Georgia Railway & Power Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,

464 vs.

The Mayor and Council of the City of College Park.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Walter T. Colquitt for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. J. Howell Green for the defendant in error in No. 463, by Mr. Frank Harwell for the defendant in error in No. 463, and by Mr. George P. Whitman for the defendant in error in No. 464.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, April 25th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. H. Crim, it is ordered that Clifford H. Byrnes, Esquire, of Cohasset, State of Massachusetts, and John E. Joyce, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Georgia Railway & Power Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
463 vs.
The Town of Decatur; and
Georgia Railway & Power Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
464 vs.
The Mayor and Council of the City of College Park.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. George P. Whitman for the defendant in error in No. 464, and concluded by Mr. Walter T. Colquitt for the plaintiffs in error.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Appellant,
724 vs.
H. A. Doughton, Commissioner of Revenue, etc., et al.;

Norfolk Southern Railroad Company,
Appellant,
727 vs.
R. A. Daughton, Commissioner, etc.,
et al.;
Seaboard Air Line Railway Company,
Appellant,
744 vs.
R. A. Daughton, Commissioner, etc.,
et al.; and
Southern Railway Company, Appellant,
756 vs.
R. A. Daughton, Commissioner, etc.,
et al.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Thomas W. Davis for the appellant in No. 724; continued by Mr. George H. Brown for the appellees, continued by Mr. W. B. Redman for the appellant in No. 727; by Mr. William P. Bynum for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. S. R. Prince for the appellant in No. 756.

Asgee Company of China et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error and Appellants,
706 vs.
The United States; and
Hanolaire Trading Corporation et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error and Appellants,
707 vs.
The United States.

These cases were submitted by Mr. W. K. Olcott and Mr. A. A. Silberberg for the plaintiffs in error and appellants, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim, Mr. Clifford H. Hymes, and Mr. Francis A. McGurk for the defendants in error and appellees.

Joe Bonner, Appellant,
288 vs.
J. C. Middlebrooke, Sheriff, etc.
M. Napier for the appellee.

The case was argued by Mr. John Randolph Cooper for the appellant, and case submitted by Mr. George

The United States, Appellant,
307 vs.

American Linseed Oil
Company, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. James A. Fowler for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, April 26th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William A. Oldfield, it is ordered that Charles F. Cole, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry W. Anderson, it is ordered that John Paul, Esquire, of Harrisonburg, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George M. Morris, it is ordered that Joseph I. Brody, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Walsh, it is ordered that Louis A. Spiess, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States, Appellant,
307 vs.
American Linseed Oil Company et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. James A. Fowler for the appellant, by Mr. John Walsh and Mr. Thomas M. Debevoise for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. James A. Fowler for the appellant.

Rindge Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error.
237 vs.
County of Los Angeles.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Edward Stafford for the plaintiffs in error, continued by Mr. Paul Vallee for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Nathan Newby for the plaintiffs in error.

Taggarts Paper Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
96 vs.
The State of New York.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Adelbert Moot for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, April 27th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander W. Smith, it is ordered that John L. Smith, Esquire, of Catlettsburg, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis L. Kohlman, it is ordered that Cyrus F. Smythe, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. Barrett Prettyman, it is ordered that Alben F. Bates, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William A. Glasgow, Jr., it is ordered that James H. Hughes, Jr., Esquire, of Wilmington, State of Delaware, and Joseph J. Brown, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Ex parte in the matter of Edward
M. Fuller and William F. McGee,
Individually and as Copartners,

doing business as E. M.
Fuller & Company, Bank-
rupts, Petitioners.
---, Original.

The motion for a stay herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William J. Fallon, Mr. Eugene P. McGee, and Mr. Arthur Garfield Hays for the petitioners in support of the motion, and by Mr. Francis L. Kohlman, Mr. William M. Chadbourne, and Mr. Cyrus P. Smythe in opposition thereto.

Ex parte in the matter of
Edward M. Fuller and William
F. McGee, Individually and
as Copartners, doing business
as E. M. Fuller & Company,
Bankrupts, Petitioners.
---, Original.

On motion of Mr. John Caldwell Myers in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Joab H. Banton, District Attorney for New York County, as amicus curiae.

Taggarts Paper Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
96 vs.
The State of New York.

The argument of this case was continued by Mrs. Helen Z. M. Rodgers for the plaintiffs in error, by Mr. Irving I. Goldsmith for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mrs. Helen Z. M. Rodgers for the plaintiff in error. Leave was granted plaintiff in error to file memorandum by Monday next.

Charles Wolff Packing
Company, Plaintiff in Error,
739 vs.
Court of Industrial Relations
of the State of Kansas.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. D. R. Hite for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. John G. Egan and Mr. Chester I. Long for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. John S. Dean for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, April 30th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

Willis Van Devanter,

James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.

Louis D. Brandeis,

George Sutherland,

Pierce Butler,

Edward T. Sanford.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that Dean Hill Stanley, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. Mitchell Palmer, it is ordered that Julius R. Samuels, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Norman B. Beecher, it is ordered that Louis E. Whitehead, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Weston Allen, it is ordered that Frederick W. McEnerney, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Seth W. Richardson, it is ordered that George F. Shafer, Esquire, of Bismarck, State of North Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William A. Glasgow, Jr., it is ordered that Lewis C. Williams, Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Anthony J. Grasso, it is ordered that Bernard W. McElroy, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, and Michael S. Gerrezin, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Douglas Hudson, it is ordered that Samuel Feller, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William T. Kelley, it is ordered that William A. Sutherland, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Lamar, it is ordered that Ira P. Thompson, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Yuma County Water Users' Association, Robert H. Theilmann, J. A. Donovan, et al., Appellants, vs. W. W. Schlecht and David C. Taylor.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

268

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and

that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

J. S. Cullinan, Plaintiff in Error,
301 vs.
A. S. Walker, as Collector of Internal Revenue for the First District of Texas.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Cunard Steam Ship Company, Limited, and Anchor Line (Henderson Bros.) Ltd., Appellants,
659 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.
Specially Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The Oceanic Steam Navigation Company, Limited, Appellant,

660 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary
of the Treasury of the United
States, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.
Specially Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Sutherland.

International Navigation
Company, Limited, Appellant,
661 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of
the Treasury of the United
States, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.
Specially Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Compagnie Generale Transatlantique, Appellant,
662 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.
Specially Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The Netherlands-American Steam Navigation Company (Holland America Line), Appellant,
666 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.
Specially Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Liverpool, Brazil and River Plate Steam Navigation Company, Limited, Appellant,
667 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Specially Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The Royal Mail Steam Packet Company, Appellant,
668 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Specially dissenting:
Mr. Justice Sutherland.

United Steamship Company of Copenhagen (Scandinavian American Line), Appellant,

669 vs.

Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.
Specially Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The Pacific Steam Navigation Company, Appellant,
670 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Specially Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Navigazione Generale Italiana,
Appellant,
678 vs.

Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary
of the Treasury of the United
States, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Specially dissenting:
Mr. Justice Sutherland.

International Mercantile
Marine Company, Appellant,
693 vs.
H. C. Stuart, Acting Collector of Customs for the
Port of New York, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Specially dissenting:
Mr. Justice Sutherland.

United American Lines, Incorporated, et al., Appellants,

694 vs.

Henry C. Stuart, Acting Collector of Customs for the Port of New York, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Specially dissenting:
Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The People of the State of New York on the relation of Emeline F. Clyde, Plaintiff in Error,

318 vs.

John F. Gilchrist, President, John J. Merrill and Mark Graves, as Members of the State Tax Commission of the State of New York.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Ex parte In the matter of Edward M. Fuller and William F. McGee, individually and as copartners

doing business under the name
of E. M. Fuller & Company,
Bankrupts, Petitioners.
---, Original.

On consideration of the motion for a stay herein pending the appeal,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Ex parte In the matter of
Taubel-Scott-Kitzmiller
Company, Petitioner.
---, Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of prohibition herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas Agnello et al.,
Petitioners,
1003 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Galveston Causeway Construction
Company et al., Petitioners,
995 vs.
Galveston, Harrisburg & San
Antonio Railway Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied, not only because of the character of the case, but also because of the failure to comply with the provisions of paragraph 3 of rule 37 of this court, which requires that

in the case of applications for certiorari the petition shall contain only a summary and short statement of the matter involved and the general reasons relied on for the allowance of the writ, and provides that a failure to comply with that requirement will be deemed a sufficient reason for denying the petition. In the present case no such statement was filed, although there was a record of 1,000 pages. Instead of such a statement, we were invited to examine a brief of 263 pages.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles E. Albury, Petitioner,
399 vs.
Benjamin E. Dyson, United States Marshal, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lehigh & Hudson River Railway Company, Petitioner,
805 vs.
Florence M. Otterstedt, on behalf of herself and minor children.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Third Department, of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Third Department, of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ike Windsor, Petitioner,
922 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company, Petitioner,
959 vs.
Robert W. Blake, a minor, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company, Petitioner,
960 vs.
Grace Twiggs Blake.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk Telegraph Company, Plaintiff in Error,
972 vs.
John I. Dolan, Collector of Taxes, etc.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The I. T. S. Rubber Company, Petitioner,
975 vs.
United States Rubber Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Emanuel Bookbinder, Petitioner,
990 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Adams Express Company, Plaintiff in Error,
865 vs.
W. W. Darden.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the case on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joe Bonner, Appellant,
288 vs.
J. C. Middlebrooks, Sheriff of Jones County, Georgia.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

ORDER.

The call of the docket will be suspended for the term on Friday, May 4th next, and the Court will take a recess from Monday, May 7th, to Monday, May 21st.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

ORDER.

No petitions for writs of certiorari or motions, except motions for admission to practice, will be received after Monday, June 4, next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Complainant, ---, Orig'l. vs. The State of Minnesota.

The motion for leave to file bill of complaint herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the complainant.

Laura Lyon, Appellant, 665 vs. Charles B. Lohmiller, as Superintendent and Disbursing Agent, etc.

The motion to dismiss or affirm herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Hiter, and Mr. Harry L. Underwood for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. Charles J. Kappler and Mr. Hiram Chase for the appellant in opposition thereto.

Clallam County, Washington, et al., 925 vs. The United States of America et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the United States et al.

William H. Edwards, formerly Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., Petitioner, 974 vs. Joseph Jermain Slocum et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert Thorne for the respondents.

The United States of America, Petitioner, 994 vs. Gulf Refining Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner, and by Mr. R. L. Batts and Mr. Frank M. Swacker for the respondent.

A. N. Leecraft, Plaintiff in Error, 629 vs. The Texas Company.

The motion to dismiss the writ of error in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. Mitchell Palmer in behalf of Mr. C. B. Ames for the defendant in error in support of the motion and by Mr. George P. Short and Mr. C. W. King for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Magnum Import Company (Inc.),
Petitioner,
978. vs.
Francois Joseph de Spoturno Coty;
Max L. Cohn, trading as the
Maclen Import Company (Inc.),
Petitioner,
979 vs.
Francois Joseph de Spoturno Coty;
Arthur Baum and Ruth Baum, trading
as The Beautex Company, Petitioners,
980 vs.
Francois Joseph de Spoturno Coty;
Magnum Import Company (Inc.),
Petitioner,
981 vs.
Houbigant (Inc.); and
Ivory Novelties Trading Company
(Inc.), Petitioner,
982 vs.
Francois Joseph de Spoturno Coty.

The petitions for writs of certiorari in these cases were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Otto Schlobohm in behalf of Mr. Charles H. Tuttle and Mr. William J. Hughes for the petitioners, and by Mr. Hugo Mock, Mr. Asher Blum, and Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for the respondents in Nos. 978, 979, 980, and 982; and by Mr. Lindley M. Garrison, Mr. George S. Hornblower, Mr. Raoul E. Desvernine, and Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for the respondent in No.981.

Fred W. Schutz, Herman H. Shutz,
Amelia S. Maxwell, et al., Plaintiffs
in Error,
226 vs.
Justus S. Wardell, United States
Collector of Internal Revenue for the
First District of California.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash, in behalf of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Queen Insurance Company of

America, Petitioner,
579 vs.
Globe & Rutgers Fire Insurance Company.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash in behalf of Mr. D. Roger Englar and Mr. George H. Houston for the petitioner.

Ray Levinson, Petitioner,
1023 vs.
William A. Greene, Trustee, etc.; and
Manhattan Investment Company, Petitioner,
1024 vs.
William A. Greene, Trustee, etc.

On motion of Mr. Robert Ash for the petitioners, leave was granted to file additional brief for the petitioners in these cases.

First National Bank in St. Louis, Plaintiff in Error,
919 vs.
State of Missouri, at the information of Jesse W. Barrett, Attorney General.

The motion of Mr. James M. Beck for leave to file brief of John A. Garver as amicus curiae herein was denied.

First National Bank in St. Louis, Plaintiff in Error,
919 vs.
State of Missouri, at the information of Jesse W. Barrett, Attorney General.

On motion of Mr. Robert P. Stewart in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of John Quinn, Paul Kiefer, and Robert P. Stewart herein as amici curiae, with leave to defendant in error to file reply within two days.

Harriet A. Frothingham, Appellant,
962 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury, et al.

On motion of Mr. Henry St. George Tucker, leave was granted to file brief as amicus curiae herein.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Complainant,
24, Orig'l. vs.

Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the
Treasury, et al.; and
Harriet A. Frothingham, Appellant,
962 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of
the Treasury, et al.

On motion of Mr. Frederick A. Fenning in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Everett P. Wheeler and Waldo G. Morse as amici curiae herein.

First National Bank in St. Louis,
Plaintiff in Error,
919 vs.
State of Missouri, at the information
of Jesse W. Barrett, Attorney General.

The motion of Mr. William Rothmann to file brief on behalf of the States of Illinois, Connecticut, North Dakota, Washington, Wisconsin, Iowa, Arkansas, Minnesota, Indiana, and Kansas, as amici curiae herein, was denied.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts,
Complainant,
24, Orig'l. vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the
Treasury, et al.

On motion of Mr. Charles K. Burdick in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the Association of Land Grant Colleges as amicus curiae herein.

Four-in-One Coal Company, Petitioner,
954 vs.
Eli H. Brown.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Emile Steinfeld and Mr. D. A. Sachs, Jr., for the petitioner.

Tony Panzich and Mary Panzich,
Petitioners,
961 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank P. Doherty for the petitioner.

C. W. Johnson, Trustee in Bankruptcy
of the Visible Measure Gasoline Dispenser
Company of America, Petitioner,
968 vs.
Grainger & Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. A. Sachs, Jr., and Mr. Emile Steinfeld for the petitioner.

Moo H. Baron et al.,
Petitioners,
983 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edmund H. Moore for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

A. Baldini, Petitioner,
989 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mrs. Annette Abbot Adams for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt in opposition thereto.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, etc.,
Petitioner,
1002 vs.
Ellen A. Long, Administratrix of Edward R. Long.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles C. Paulding and Mr. Leroy B. Williams for the petitioners, and by Mr. George H. Bond and Mr. A. Lee Olmsted for the respondent.

George R. Broadwell,
Petitioner,
1009 vs.
The Board of County Commissioners of Bryan County, Oklahoma.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George P. Glaze for the petitioner.

Samuel Krivit et al.,
Petitioners,
1011 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis Marshall for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Cudahy Packing Company of Nebraska, Plaintiff in Error,
547 vs.
Mary Ann Parramore, as Widow, etc., et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William A. Hilton for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. George T. Buckingham for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Wagner Electric Manufacturing Company, Appellant,

Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the
Treasury, et al.; and
Harriet A. Frothingham, Appellant,
962 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of
the Treasury, et al.

On motion of Mr. Frederick A. Fenning in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Everett P. Wheeler and Waldo G. Morse as amici curiae herein.

First National Bank in St. Louis,
Plaintiff in Error,
919 vs.
State of Missouri, at the information
of Jesse W. Barrett, Attorney General.

The motion of Mr. William Rothmann to file brief on behalf of the States of Illinois, Connecticut, North Dakota, Washington, Wisconsin, Iowa, Arkansas, Minnesota, Indiana, and Kansas, as amici curiae herein, was denied.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts,
Complainant,
24, Orig'l. vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the
Treasury, et al.

On motion of Mr. Charles E. Burdick in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the Association of Land Grant Colleges as amicus curiae herein.

Four-in-One Coal Company, Petitioner,
954 vs.
Eli H. Brown.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Emile Steinfeld and Mr. D. A. Sachs, Jr., for the petitioner.

Tony Panzich and Mary Panzich,
Petitioners,
961 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank P. Doherty for the petitioner.

C. W. Johnson, Trustee in Bankruptcy
of the Visible Measure Gasoline Dispenser
Company of America, Petitioner,
968 vs.
Grainger & Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. A. Sachs, Jr., and Mr. Emile Steinfeld for the petitioner.

Moe H. Baron et al.,
Petitioners,
985 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edmund H. Moore for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

A. Baldini, Petitioner,
989 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mrs. Annette Abbot Adams for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt in opposition thereto.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, etc.,
Petitioner,
1002 vs.
Ellen A. Long, Administratrix of Edward R. Long.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles C. Paulding and Mr. Leroy B. Williams for the petitioners, and by Mr. George H. Bond and Mr. A. Lee Olmsted for the respondent.

George R. Broadwell,
Petitioner,
1009 vs.
The Board of County Commissioners of Bryan County, Oklahoma.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George P. Glaze for the petitioner.

Samuel Krivit et al.,
Petitioners,
1011 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis Marshall for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Cudahy Packing Company of Nebraska, Plaintiff in Error,
547 vs.
Mary Ann Parramore, as Widow, etc., et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William A. Hilton for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. George T. Buckingham for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Wagner Electric Manufacturing Company, Appellant,

738 vs.
Lamar Lyndon et al.

The motion to dismiss this appeal was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lawrence C. Kingsland and Mr. John D. Rippey for the appellees in support of the motion, and by Mr. Charles A. Houts for the appellant in opposition thereto.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
957 vs.
Mrs. Lulu Morgan.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, State of Louisiana.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry T. Graham, Individually and as Former Collector, etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
846 vs.
Alfred I. du Pont.

This cause was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioners, and by Mr. William A. Glasgow, Jr., for the respondent.

American Bank & Trust Company,
Appellant,
717 vs.
Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta;
and
Farmers and Merchants Bank of Monroe, North Carolina, et al., Petitioners,
823 vs.
Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond, Virginia.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Alexander W. Smith for the appellant and petitioners.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, May 1st, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts,
Complainant,
20, Orig'l. vs.
The State of New York et al.

On motion of Mr. Arthur E. Sunderland in that behalf, leave was granted to file answer and supplemental answer of defendant Ontario Beach Hotel & Amusement Company and answer of defendant The Upton Company.

First National Bank in St. Louis, Plaintiff in Error and Petitioner,
919 vs.
The State of Missouri upon information of Jesse W. Barrett, Attorney General.

On motion of Mr. William Rothmann in behalf of the Attorneys General of the States of Illinois, Connecticut, North Dakota, Washington, Wisconsin, Iowa, Arkansas, Minnesota, Indiana, and Kansas, and United States Bankers' Association Opposed to Branch Banking, leave was granted to file brief herein as amici curiae.

American Bank & Trust Company,
Appellant,
717 vs.
Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta;
and
Farmers and Merchants Bank of Monroe, North Carolina, et al.,
Petitioners.

823 vs.
Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond,
Virginia.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Alexander W. Smith for the appellant and petitioners; by Mr. John J. Parker for the petitioners in No. 823; by Mr. John W. Davis for the appellee and respondent; by Mr. Henry W. Anderson for the respondent in No. 823; and concluded by Mr. Alexander W. Smith for the appellant and petitioners.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts,
Complainant,
20, Orig'l. vs.
The State of New York et al.

This case was argued on the motion to dismiss by Mr. Harry C. Miller for John Albert Granger et al., certain defendants, and by Mr. Edwin H. Abbot, Jr., for the complainant.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts,
Complainant,
20, Original. vs.
The State of New York, The City of Rochester, James L. Hotchkiss, Clerk of the County of Monroe, State of New York, et al.

On consideration of the motion of John Albert Granger, Emma R. Granger and Gideon Granger herein, to dismiss the bill of complaint as to them, and the argument of counsel thereupon had,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied without prejudice.

It is further ordered by this Court that this case stand over for hearing on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Willard Sutherland & Company,
Appellant,
209 vs.
The United States; and
William C. Atwater & Company
(Inc.), Appellant,
218 vs.
The United States.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Thomas R. Rutter for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, May 2nd, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William G. Brantley, it is ordered that Paul E. Seabrook, Esquire, of Savannah, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rufus S. Day, it is ordered that Stuart Montgomery, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merrill E. Otis, it is ordered that Charles L. Faust, Esquire, of St. Joseph, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Dharandas Tulsidas et al.,
Petitioners,
77 vs.
Insular Collector of Customs.

This case was submitted by Mr. Adam C. Carson for the petitioners and by Mr. Grant T. Trent and Mr. Logan N. Rock for the respondent.

Harry Palmer, Plaintiff in Error,
375 vs.
The State of Indiana.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana.

This cause came on to be heard, and it appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Willard, Sutherland & Company, Appellant,
209 vs.
The United States; and
William G. Atwater & Company (Inc.), Appellant,
218 vs.
The United States.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Thomas R. Rutter for the appellants, by Mr. Rufus S. Day for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Gibbs L. Baker for the appellants.

Henry E. Stevens, Jr., Petitioner,
200 vs.
Arthur S. Arnold et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Harvey P. Carr for the petitioner and by Mr. Robert H. McCarter for the respondents.

Max Hart, Appellant,
763 vs.
B. F. Keith Vaudeville Exchange et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Martin W. Littleton for the appellant and continued by Mr. George Wharton Pepper for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, May 3rd, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, it is ordered that M. Michael Edelstein, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Mabel W. Willebrandt, it is ordered that Hyman Levin, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred M. Craven, it is ordered that F. L. Stotler, Esquire, of Colfax, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

First National Bank in St. Louis, Plaintiff in Error,
919 vs.
State of Missouri upon the information of Jesse W. Barrett, Attorney General.

The motion for leave to file brief of the National City Bank of New York et al., as amici curiae herein, on motion of Mr. Otto Schlobohm, was denied.

Elizabeth W. Platt et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,

1060 vs.

David R. Francis et al.

In Error to the Circuit Court of the City of St. Louis, State of Missouri.

Mr. George H. Lamar, of counsel for the defendants in error, having filed in open Court the following certificate, to wit:

"I, John Schmoll, Clerk of the Circuit Court of the City of St. Louis, do hereby certify that in a certain cause pending in said Court, wherein Elizabeth W. Platt, Henry S. Platt, Jr., James L. Platt, Edward B. Platt, Grace Platt Smith, Richard B. Platt and Philip C. Platt were plaintiffs, and David R. Francis, Thomas H. Francis, William P. Kennett, J. D. Perry Francis, David R. Francis, Jr., Charles H. Hiemenz and Charles R. Platt were defendants, a final judgment was rendered by said Court on the 1st day of June, 1914, in favor of the said defendants and against the said plaintiffs, and that on the 31st day of May, 1916, said plaintiffs sued out a writ of error to the Supreme Court of the United States.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed the seal of said Court, at the City of St. Louis, Missouri, this 30th day of April, 1923.

(SEAL). (Signed) JOHN SCHMOLL, Clerk",

and moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the ninth rule,

And it appearing to the Court that the plaintiffs in error have failed to have their cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court,

It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause to the Circuit Court of the City of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be, and the same is hereby, docketed and dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Max Hart, Appellant,

763 vs.

B. F. Keith Vaudeville Exchange et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. George Wharton Pepper for the appellees and concluded by Mr. Martin W. Littleton for the appellant.

Simon Hecht et al.,
Trustees, Petitioners,
532 vs.
John F. Malley, former
Collector of Internal
Revenue;
Arthur L. Howard et al.,
Petitioners,
533 vs.
John F. Malley, former
Collector of Internal
Revenue;
Arthur L. Howard et al.,
Petitioners,
534 vs.
Andrew J. Casey, former
Acting Collector of
Internal Revenue; and
Alvah Crocker et al.,
Trustees, Petitioners,
587 vs.
John F. Malley, Collector.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Edward F. McClennen for the petitioners in Nos. 532, 533, and 534; continued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Harrison M. Davis for the petitioners in No. 587.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts,
Complainant,
24, Orig'l. vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of
the Treasury, et al.; and
Harriet A. Frothingham,
Appellant,
962 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of
the Treasury, et al.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the defendants in No. 24, Original, and for the appellees in No. 962. Continued by Mr. Alexander Lincoln for the State of Massachusetts.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, May 4th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that Carl C. Jones, Esquire, of Portland, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander T. Vogelsang, it is ordered that Charlotte F. Jones, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry St. George Tucker, it is ordered that Joseph S. Dickey, Esquire, of Henrietta, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Noble Gregory, it is ordered that Albert B. Kerr, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Complainant,
24, Orig'l. vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of

Harriet A. Frothingham,
Appellant,
962 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary
of the Treasury, et al.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Alexander Lincoln for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, by Mr. William L. Rawls for the appellant in No. 962, by Mr. J. Weston Allen for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury, et al.

Charles Glen Collins,
Appellant,
880 vs.
Victor Loisel, United
States Marshal for the
Eastern District of
Louisiana.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. J. Zack Spearing for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Charles Glen Collins,
Appellant,
880 vs.
Victor Loisel, United
States Marshal for the
Eastern District of Louisiana.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George F. Shafer, as Attorney
General, etc., et al.,
Appellants,
958 vs.
Farmers Grain Company of

Emdben et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Seth W. Richardson for the appellants, and by Mr. David F. Simpson for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

The call of the docket has been suspended for the term.

Monday, May 7th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry L. Moses, it is ordered that Joseph J. Bach, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. M. Joseph Donovan, it is ordered that Rodolfo Ramirez Pabon, Esquire, of Rio Piedras, Porto Rico, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Holmus, it is ordered that George Pfeil, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otto A. Schlobohm, it is ordered that Laurence M. Pine, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Malcolm A. Colen, it is ordered that Victor House, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. White, Jr., it is ordered that Henry C. Hotchkiss, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John E. Benton, it is ordered that Verner Gabrielson, Esquire, of Fort Dodge, and Maxwell A. O'Brien, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

William R. Begg and Arthur C. Hume, Receivers of the Manhattan and Queens Traction Corporation, Appellants, vs. The City of New York et al. — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

5

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

The City of Trenton, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of New Jersey. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey.

430

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The City of Newark, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of New Jersey. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey.

469

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Oliver Iron Mining Company, Appellant, vs. Samuel Lord et al. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

560

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Cleveland-Cliffs Iron Company, Appellant, vs. Samuel Lord et al. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

561

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Mesaba - Cliffs Iron Mining Company, Appellant, vs. Samuel Lord et al. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

562

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed

by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Bennett Mining Company et al., Appellants, vs. Samuel Lord et al. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

563

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Republic Iron & Steel Company et al., Appellants, vs. Samuel Lord et al. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

564

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The Biwabik Mining Company et al., Appellants, vs. Samuel Lord et al. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

565

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Inter-State Iron Company, Appellant, vs. Samuel Lord et al. 566

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The United States, Petitioner, vs. Wesley L. Sischo. 76

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Francisco Bianchi etc., et al., Appellants, vs. Manuel Mendia Morales et al. 934

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for Porto Rico.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for Porto Rico, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Elmore D. Dier, Harry J. Lawrence, Jr.,

and Lawrence Starr, etc., et al.,
Appellants,
330 vs.
Joab H. Banton, District Attorney
of the County of New York, and
Manfred W. Ehrich, Trustee in
Bankruptcy.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Easgee Company of China and David Schratter, Plaintiffs in Error and Appellants,
706 vs.
The United States of America.

In Error to and Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hamelaire Trading Corporation and David Schratter, Plaintiffs in Error and Appellants,
707 vs.
The United States of America.

In Error to and Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Magnum Import Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
978 vs.
Francois Joseph de Spoturno
Coty;
Max L. Cohn, trading as The
Maclen Import Company,
Petitioner,
979 vs.
Francois Joseph de Spoturno
Coty;
Arthur Baum and Ruth Baum,
trading as The Beautex Company,
Petitioners,
980 vs.
Francois Joseph de Spoturno
Coty;
Magnum Import Company,
Petitioner,
981 vs.
Houbigant, Inc.
Ivory Novelties Trading
Company, Petitioner,
982 vs.
Francois Joseph de Spoturno
Coty.

On consideration of the petitions for suspending orders in these cases,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petitions be, and the same are hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

The United States of America,
Complainant,
--- Orig'l. vs.
The State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby,

granted; and that process issue returnable on Monday, October 1, 1923.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Clallam County, Washington,
925 vs.
The United States of America et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Queen Insurance Company of America, Petitioner,
579 vs.
Globe & Rutgers Fire Insurance Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Laura Lyon, Appellant,
665 vs.
Charles B. Lohmiller, as Superintendent and Disbursing Agent, etc.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Taggarts Paper Company, Plaintiff in Error,
96 vs.
The State of New York.

In Error to the Court of Claims of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William H. Edwards, Formerly Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., Petitioner,
974 vs.
Joseph Jermain Slocum et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr.Chief Justice Taft.

Magnum Import Company, Inc., Petitioner,
978 vs.
Francois Joseph de Spoturno Coty.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Max L. Cohn, trading as The Maclen Import Company, Petitioner,
979 vs.
Francois Joseph de Spoturno Coty.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arthur Baum et al., Petitioners,
980 vs.
Francois Joseph de Spoturno Coty.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the

argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Magnum Import Company, Inc., Petitioner,
981 vs.
Houbigant, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ivory Novelties Trading Company, Inc., Petitioner,
982 vs.
Francois Joseph de Spoturno Coty.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
994 vs.
Gulf Refining Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Four-in-One Coal Company, Petitioner,
954 vs.
Eli H. Brown.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the

argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Tony Panzich et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 961

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. W. Johnston, Trustee in Bankruptcy, etc., Petitioner, vs. Grainger & Company. 968

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Moe H. Baron et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 983

On petition for writ of certiorari to The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. Baldini, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 989

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the

argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, etc., Petitioner,
1002 vs.
Ellen A. Long, Administratrix of Edward R. Long.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George R. Broadwell, Petitioner,
1009 vs.
The Board of County Commissioners of Bryan County, Oklahoma.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel Krivit et al., Petitioners,
1011 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ray Levinson, Petitioner,
1023 vs.
William A. Greene, Trustee, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and of the argument of counsel

thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Manhattan Investment Company, Petitioner, 1024 vs. William A. Greene, Trustee, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Agent, Plaintiff in Error, 999 vs. George D. Henderson.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Benjamin Gitlow, Plaintiff in Error, 770 vs. The People of the State of New York.

It is ordered by this Court that this cause be restored to the docket for reargument.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, as Agent, etc., Plaintiff in Error, 876 vs. W. M. Scroggins.

The motion to dismiss or affirm herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Cone Johnson, Mr. James M. Edwards, and Mr. Fred V. Hughes for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Ras Young and Mr. George Thompson for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

First National Bank in St. Louis, Plaintiff in Error, 919 vs. The State of Missouri at the information of Jesse W. Barrett, Attorney General.

On motion of Mr. Otto Schlobohm in behalf of counsel for the National City Bank of New York et al., leave was granted to file brief herein as amici curiae.

Louis B. Mackenzie, Petitioner,
1041 vs.
A. Engelhard & Sons Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. A. McDowell in behalf of Mr. William Marshall Bullitt for the petitioner.

A. Engelhard &Sons Company,
Petitioner,
1052 vs.
Louis B. Mackenzie.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. A. McDowell for the petitioner.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
957 vs.
Mrs. Lulu Morgan.

On consideration of the motion of counsel for the petitioner for leave to withdraw the certified record heretofore filed in this cause as an exhibit to the petition for a writ of certiorari,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and the Clerk is directed to return the record to the Clerk of the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, State of Louisiana, and take his receipt therefor.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Union Stock Yards Company of Omaha (Ltd.), Plaintiff in Error,
409 vs.
Mayhall & Heible, a Copartnership, et al., etc.

On motion of Mr. A. A. McLaughlin in that behalf, James C. Davis, as Director General, etc., was substituted as a party defendant in error herein.

The motion to dismiss the writ of error in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. A. McLaughlin, Mr. Francis A. Brogan, Mr. Alfred C. Ellick, Mr. Anon Raymond, Mr. Bruce Scott, and Mr. Byron Clark for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Morris Brown and Mr. Irving P. Baxter for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

J. P. Hughes, Petitioner,
916 vs.
The United States Borax Company.

The motion to waive Section 4 of Rule 37, and the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Albert E. Sherman for the petitioner.

Elizabeth W. Platt et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,

1060 vs.
David R. Francis et al.

On motion of Mr. Robert Ash in that behalf, mandate was granted in this cause.

The Idaho Irrigation Company, Limited, et al., Appellants,
1057 vs.
Fred W. Gooding et al.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash in behalf of counsel for the appellants.

William C. Olander, Plaintiff in Error,
556 vs.
T. P. Hallowell.

The motion to dismiss or affirm, and stipulation to correct record, were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Maxwell A. O'Brien, Mr. B. J. Flick, and Mr. Ben J. Gibson for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Robert Healy for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian, et al., Appellants,
966 vs.
Frederick Y. Robertson.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles W. Stockton for the appellee.

Gustave Porges, on behalf of himself and others, etc., Petitioners,
1026 vs.
James R. Sheffield, Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. B. Kerr, Mr. Henry G. Gray, Mr. Sol M. Stroock, and Mr. George Zabriskie for the petitioners, and by Mr. Alfred A. Cook and Mr. Harold Nathan for the respondent.

City of Los Angeles et al., Petitioners,
973 vs.
Mono Power Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. B. Mathews for the petitioners and by Mr. Charles F. Potter for the respondents.

Frederick M. Dyer et al., Petitioners,
977 vs.
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Boyd B. Jones and Mr. Philip H. Jones for the petitioners, and by Mr. Jay R. Benton and Mr. Henry G. Attwill for

the respondent.

The Thomsil Holding Company, Petitioner, vs. Interstate Coal & Dock Company. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Howard Thayer Kingsbury for the petitioner, and by Mr. F. K. Pendleton for the respondent.

980

Morris S. Rachmil, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. C. Sugarman for the petitioner.

1001

James C. Davis, Agent, etc., Petitioner, vs. R. L. Cornwell. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. I. Parker Veasey, Jr., and Mr. A. A. McLaughlin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edwin L. Norris and Mr. George E. Hurd for the respondent.

1004

Importers Steamship Company, Claimant of the Steamship "El Amigo", et al., Petitioners, vs. Houston Marine Engineering Works et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James B. Stubbs for the petitioners; and by Mr. H. C. Hughes, Mr. Lewis R. Bryan and Mr. Sewall Myer for the respondents.

1006

Chung Fook, Petitioner, vs. Edward White, as Commissioner of Immigration, etc. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George W. Hott for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Ottinger, and Mr. Charles H. Weston for the respondent.

1008

Perkins Glue Company, Petitioner, vs. Standard Furniture Company. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas Ewing and Mr. Gorham Crosby for the petitioner, and by Mr. James A. Watson for the respondent.

1010

Western Union Telegraph Company, Petitioner,
1012 vs.
J. A. Czizek.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis Raymond Stark and Mr. Beverly L. Hodghead for the petitioner.

Claude A. P. Turner, Petitioner,
1019 vs.
Flat Slab Patents Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank A. Whiteley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Amasa C. Paul and Mr. Edward Rector for the respondent.

Claude A. P. Turner, Petitioner,
1020 vs.
Flat Slab Patents Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank A. Whiteley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Amasa C. Paul and Mr. Edward Rector for the respondent.

Baron Edmond James de Rothschild et al., Petitioners,
1027 vs.
James H. Sheffield, Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. B. Kerr, Mr. Sol M. Stroock, Mr. Henry C. Gray, and Mr. George Zabriskie for the petitioners, and by Mr. Alfred A. Cook and Mr. Harold Nathan for the respondent.

Friedlander Brothers, etc., et al., Petitioners,
1028 vs.
The City of Moultrie et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. I. J. Hofmayer and Mr. James R. Pottle for the petitioners.

Ethel James, Petitioner,
1032 vs.
James C. Davis, as Agent, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. A. Denson for the petitioner.

Graham, Chisholm & Company et al., Petitioners,
1037 vs.
John Firth.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ralph Wolf for the petitioners, and by Mr. Bernard S. Barron for the respondent.

Burns Bros., Petitioner,
1048 vs.

Steam Tug "Interstate No. 1", her engines, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Mark Ash and Mr. Edward Ash for the petitioner, and by Mr. George V. A. McCloskey for the respondent.

First National Bank in St. Louis,
Plaintiff in Error,
919 vs.
The State of Missouri, at the information of Jesse W. Barrett, Attorney General.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Frank H. Sullivan for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. Merrill E. Otis for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Harold R. Small for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, May 21, next, at 12 o'clock.

Monday, May 21st, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

Willis Van Devanter,

James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.

Louis D. Brandeis,

George Sutherland,

Pierce Butler,

Edward T. Sanford,

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that John J. Keenan, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and G. H. Martin, Esquire, of Ancon, Canal Zone, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Woodson P. Houghton, it is ordered that George L. Cohen, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Lamar, it is ordered that Lucius Lamar Mayes, Esquire, of Jackson, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Walsh, it is ordered that Joseph B. Kaufman, Esquire, and Arthur Leonard Ross, Esquire, of New York City, and Egbert Rosecrans, Esquire, of Blairstown, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Mabel W. Willebrandt, it is ordered that Carina C. Warrington, of Fort Wayne, State

of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Homer Guerry, it is ordered that C. H. Foot, Esquire, of Kalispell, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. A. McLaughlin, it is ordered that Lambert McAllister, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otto A. Schlobohm, it is ordered that June Purcell-Guild, of Toledo, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Weston, it is ordered that John Alford Hanna, Esquire, of Auburn, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James S. Easby-Smith, it is ordered that Francis W. Hill, Jr., Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Roach, it is ordered that Moses Cohen, Esquire, and Laurence J. Bershad, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry L. Underwood, it is ordered that C. R. Bradford, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Borah, it is ordered that Harold E. Neibling, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this

Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. H. Rumble, it is ordered that E. R. F. Wells, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Thomas D. McCarthy, United States Marshal for the Southern District of New York, Appellant,
404 vs.
Jules W. Arndstein.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

L. Vogelstein & Company, Inc.,
Appellant,
269 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjuiged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

L. Vogelstein & Company, Inc.,
269 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion of counsel for the appellant to remand this cause to the Court of Claims for further findings of fact,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. New River Collieries Company. 316

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

International Life Insurance Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Adrian F. Sherman. 295

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

International Life Insurance Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Adrian F. Sherman, 295

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

W. T. Campbell, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of Olney. 266

In Error to the County Court of Young County, State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the County Court of Young County, State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this

Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

South Utah Mines & Smelters, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Beaver County. — In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Utah.

321

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Utah, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

David H. Riddle, Appellant, vs. James E. Dyche, Warden of the United States Penitentiary at Atlanta. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

663

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, as Agent, etc., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Farmers Cooperative Equity Company. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

270

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this

Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

(Mr. Justice Butler took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

The Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway, Illinois Central Railroad Company, and Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Appellants,
396 vs.
The State of Tennessee, B. A. Enloe, Harvey H. Hannah, Julian H. Campbell, Members of and constituting the Railroad and Public Utilities Commission of the State of Tennessee, et al., etc.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Tennessee.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Tennessee, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

(Mr. Justice Sanford took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

The United States, Appellant,
429 vs.
The State of Tennessee, The Railroad and Public Utilities Commission of Tennessee, etc., et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Tennessee.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the

District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Tennessee, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

(Mr. Justice Sanford took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

Ex parte In the matter of James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, Operating the Lehigh Valley Transportation System, Petitioner. 27, Original.

This cause came on to be heard on the petition for a writ of prohibition and/or a writ of mandamus and the return to the rule to show cause, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that said rule to show cause be discharged and that the prayer of the said petition be denied.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The State of Missouri ex rel. Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, Plaintiff in Error, 158 vs. Public Service Commission of Missouri and John A. Kurts, Edwin J. Bean, Hugh McIndoe, et al., etc.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Specially concurring:
Mr. Justice Brandeis,
Mr. Justice Holmes.

Henry E. Stevens, Jr., Petitioner,
200 vs.
Arthur S. Arnold, Abram L. Erlanger, and Real Estate Title Insurance & Trust Company of Philadelphia, Executors, etc.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey with directions to dismiss the bill and cross-bill.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Max Hart, Appellant,
763 vs.
B. F. Keith Vaudeville Exchange, Orpheum Circuit, Inc., Excelsior Collection Agency, Inc., et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dharandas Tulsidas, Naraindas Lekhraj, and Allumal Hackumal Sukhrani,
Petitioners,
77 vs.
The Insular Collector of Customs.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the

Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the final order of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, Douglas H. Johnson, Governor of the Chickasaw Nation, and William F. Semple, Principal Chief of the Choctaw Nation, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States on the relation of McAlester-Edwards Coal Company.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

258

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Steel Foundries, Appellant, vs. Thomas E. Robertson, Commissioner of Patents, and Simplex Electric Heating Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

291

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Curtis, Collins and Holbrook Company, Appellant,

341 vs.

The United States of America.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Curtis, Collins & Holbrook Company, Appellant, vs. The United States of America. — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

342

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Curtis, Collins and Holbrook Company, Appellant, vs. The United States of America. — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

343

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this

cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Curtis, Collins and Holbrook Company, Appellant, 344 vs. The United States of America. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Curtis, Collins and Holbrook Company, Appellant, 345 vs. The United States of America. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Curtis, Collins and Holbrook Company, Appellant, 346 vs. The United States of America. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Curtis, Collins and Holbrook Company, Appellant, vs. The United States of America. — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

347

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Curtis, Collins and Holbrook Company, Appellant, vs. The United States of America. — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

348

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Curtis, Collins and Holbrook Company, Appellant, vs. The United States of America. — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

349

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Curtis, Collins and Holbrook Company, Appellant, 350 vs. The United States of America.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Curtis, Collins and Holbrook Company, Appellant, 351 vs. The United States of America.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Curtis, Collins and Holbrook Company, Appellant, vs. The United States of America. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

352

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Curtis, Collins and Holbrook Company, Appellant, vs. The United States of America. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

353

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Curtis, Collins and Holbrook Company, Appellant, vs. The United States of America. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

354

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this

cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Curtis, Collins and Holbrook Company, Appellant, vs. The United States of America. 355

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Curtis, Collins and Holbrook Company, Appellant, vs. The United States of America. 356

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Curtis, Collins and Holbrook Company, Appellant, vs. The United States of America. 357

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now herd ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Curtis, Collins and Holbrook Company, Appellant, vs. The United States of America. 358

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Curtis, Collins and Holbrook Company, Appellant, vs. The United States of America. 359

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Curtis, Collins and Holbrook Company, Appellant, vs. The United States of America. 360

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Curtis, Collins and Holbrook Company, Appellant, 361 vs. The United States of America. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Curtis, Collins and Holbrook Company, Appellant, 362 vs. The United States of America. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Curtis, Collins and Holbrook Company, Appellant, vs. The United States of America. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

363

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Curtis, Collins and Holbrook Company, Appellant, vs. The United States of America. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

364

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said UnitedStates Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wagner Electric Manufacturing Company, Appellant, vs. Lamar Lyndon and Charles H. Mohrstadt, Sheriff of the City of St. Louis. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

738

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the

want of jurisdiction, with damages of $1500.00, and costs as upon an affirmance of the decree of the District Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry T. Graham, Individually and as Former Collector of Internal Revenue, et al., Petitioners,
846 vs.
Alfred I. du Pont.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Delaware with directions to dissolve the temporary injunction and to dismiss the bill.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

The Young Men's Christian Association of Columbus, Ohio, et al., Petitioners,
[illegible]5 vs.
Ora Davis et al.

On consideration of the petition for rehearing herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted; and that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Idaho Irrigation Company, Limited, et al., Appellants,
1057 vs.
Fred W. Gooding et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian, et al.,

Appellants,

966 vs.

Frederick Y. Robertson.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William C. Olander, Plaintiff in Error, In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

556 vs.

T. P. Hollowell.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Union Stock Yards Company of Omaha, Limited, Plaintiff in Error, In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

409 vs.

Mayhall & Neible et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. N. Leecraft, Plaintiff in Error, In Error to the United States

629 vs. Circuit Court of Appeals for the

The Texas Company. Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cudahy Packing Company of Nebraska, Plaintiff in Error,
547 vs.
Mary Ann Parramore, as Widow, etc., et al.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

First National Bank in St. Louis, Plaintiff in Error,
919 vs.
The State of Missouri at the information of Jesse W. Barrett, Attorney General.

It is ordered by this Court that this cause be restored to the docket for reargument, at the next term, on the issue whether the State had authority to institute and maintain a proceeding to question compliance by a national Bank with its charter.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louis B. Mackenzie, Petitioner,
1041 vs.
A. Engelhard & Sons Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. Engelhard & Sons Company, Petitioner,
1052 vs.
Louis B. Mackenzie.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Western Union Telegraph Company, Petitioner,
1012 vs.
J. A. Calzek.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Agent, etc., Petitioner,
1004 vs.
R. L. Cornwell.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chung Fook, Petitioner,
1008 vs.
Edward White, as Commissioner of Immigration, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

City of Los Angeles et al., Petitioners,
973 vs.
Mono Power Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frederick M. Dyer et al., Petitioners,
977 vs.
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Massachusetts, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Thomsil Holding Corporation, Petitioner, vs. Interstate Coal & Dock Company. 988

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Morris S. Rachmil, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 1001

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit .

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Importers Steamship Company, Claimant, etc., et al., Petitioners, vs. Houston Marine Engineering Works et al. 1006

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Perkins Glue Company, Petitioner,

1010 vs.

Standard Furniture Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Claude A. P. Turner, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to
1019 & 1020 vs. the United States Circuit Court of
Flat Slab Patents Company. Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gustave Porges, on behalf of himself and others, etc., Petitioners, On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

1026 vs.

James R. Sheffield, Trustee, etc.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Baron Edmond James de Rothschild et al., Petitioners, On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of
1027 vs. Appeals for the Second Circuit.

James R. Sheffield, Trustee, etc.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Friedlander Brothers, etc., et al., Petitioners, vs. The City of Moultrie et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

1028

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ethel James, Petitioner, vs. James C. Davis, as Agent, etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

1032

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Burns Bros., Petitioner, vs. Steam Tug "Interstate No. 1", her Engines, etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

1048

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. P. Hughes, Petitioner, vs. United States Borax Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and motion to waive Rule 37.

916

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the motion to waive rule 37, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Graham, Chisholm & Company et al., Petitioners,
1037 vs.
John Firth.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied, because of failure to file petition within the time prescribed by the statute.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of The United States of America, as Owner of Nineteen Barges and Four Towboats, Petitioner.
---, Original.

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus and/or a writ of prohibition herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner.

The United States of America, Appellant,
1036 vs.
Roger B. Wood, Trustee in Bankruptcy, etc.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellant.

The United States of America, Appellant,
1073 vs.
New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange (Inc.) et al.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellant.

Dayton-Goose Creek Railway Company, Appellant,
1072 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
1040 vs.
Giuseppe Ganci.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General

Crim, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the petitioner, and by Mr. Michael Edelstein for the respondent.

David H. Riddle, Appellant,
663 vs.
James E. Dyche, Warden, etc.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee, mandate was granted in this cause.

Willis A. Murray, Petitioner,
1060 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari in forma pauperis herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George S. Shinn and Mr. Harry S. Barger for the petitioner.

John Maynard Harlan, Appellant,
543 vs.
James S. Harlan.

The motion to dismiss or affirm herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. S. Easby-Smith in behalf of Mr. Henry S. Robbins and Mr. Morris M. Townley for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. Henry E. Davis for the appellant in opposition thereto.

Goldwyn Pictures Corporation et al., Petitioners,
1053 vs.
Howells Sales Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Otto Schlobohm in behalf of Mr. Charles E. Kelly and Mr. William J. Hughes for the petitioner, with leave to counsel for the respondent to file brief in opposition on or before Thursday next.

St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company of Texas, Petitioner,
1077 vs.
John Hosey.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Q. Mahaffey for the petitioner, and by Mr. S. P. Jones for the respondent.

Ex parte In the matter of
Henry Woodhouse, Individually and as Member of the Aero Club of America, etc., Petitioner.
---, Original.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson in behalf of the petitioner.

Peoria & Pekin Union Railway Company, Appellant,

1044 vs.
The United States of America et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. S. Knapp in that behalf.

The Wichita Railroad & Light Company, Appellant,
27 vs.
The Public Utilities Commission of the State of Kansas, et al.

The motion to recall the mandate herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. M. Ward in behalf of counsel for the appellees, with leave to counsel for the appellant to file opposition on or before Thursday next.

The City of Newark, Plaintiff in Error,
469 vs.
The State of New Jersey.

The motion to stay mandate pending petition for rehearing in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Henry Butler in behalf of counsel.

Guaranty Title & Trust Corporation, Receiver, etc., Appellant,
552 vs.
The United States.

The motion of Norfolk Hampton Roads Company for leave to intervene and that appellant be required to give bond was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. H. Rumble in that behalf.

Lion Bonding & Surety Company, Petitioner,
574 vs.
A. H. Karatz; and
Department of Trade and Commerce of the State of Nebraska et al., etc., Petitioners,
467 vs.
A. J. Hertz et al., etc., Receivers, etc.

The motion to modify decree, and affidavit in support of same, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bruce W. Sanborn in that behalf, and by Mr. O. S. Spillman, Mr. John F. Stout, Mr. Halleck F. Rose, Mr. Arthur R. Wells, and Mr. Paul L. Martin for the petitioners in opposition thereto.

The United States of America ex rel. The Baldwin Company, Appellant,
918 vs.
Thomas E. Robertson, Commissioner of Patents.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the court by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, Mr. John E. Cross, Mr. John S. Flannery, and Mr.

Lawrence Maxwell for the appellant in support of the petition, and by Mr. Samuel S. Watson for the appellee in opposition thereto.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, 18, Orig'l. vs. The State of Texas, Defendant; The United States, Intervener.

On motion of Mr. John S. Flannery in that behalf, the tenth report of the Receiver was filed.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, 963 vs. Mrs. T. V. Prude.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward J. White and Mr. Thomas B. Pryor for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition.

Albert Eickel, Bankrupt, Petitioner, 964 vs. A. Robinson, Trustee of the Estate of Albert Eickel, Bankrupt.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas W. Gregory for the petitioner, and by Mr. George E. Shelley for the respondent.

J. L. Lancaster et al., Receivers of Texas & Pacific Railway Company, Petitioners, 1005 vs. Ben E. Fitch.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. H. Prendergast for the petitioners, and by Mr. Walter C. Clephane and Mr. J. Wilmer Latimer for the respondent.

Erie Railroad Company, Petitioner, 1018 vs. Martin Kirkendall.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward A. Foote for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. P. Chamberlin for the respondent.

Great Northern Railway Company, Petitioner, 1031 vs. Galbreath Cattle Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. I. Parker Veazey, Jr., and Mr. F. G. Dorety for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. E. Enterline and Mr. Samuel Herrick for the respondents.

The Lilley Building & Loan Company, Petitioner,
1033 vs.
Newton M. Miller, as Collector, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John F. Wilson, Mr. Province M. Pogue, and Mr. Oscar W. Newman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the respondent.

Jacques Rousso, Petitioner,
1034 vs.
First National Bank in Detroit, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joshua R. H. Potts for the petitioner.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner,
1035 vs.
R. L. Hanna.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward J. White and Mr. Thomas B. Pryor for the petitioner.

G.S. Swanson et al., Petitioners,
1038 vs.
Jack Sarja.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Francis Williams, Mr. Henry C. Clark, Mr. G. S. Swanson, and Mr. H. A. Swanson for the petitioners.

Clarence D. Keller et al., Doing Business as Hartford Windshield Company, Petitioners,
1039 vs.
Adams-Campbell Company (Inc.) et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles E. Townsend for the petitioners.

The Farmers' Loan & Trust Company of New York, Petitioner,
1043 vs.
Wilcox County, Georgia.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John H. F. Smith for the petitioner.

T. R. Bennett, Superintendent of Banks for the State of Georgia, Petitioner,
1045 vs.
John E. Schwartz et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George M. Napier and Mr. Paul E. Seabrook for the petitioner and by Mr. H. Wiley Johnson for the respondents.

The London & Lancashire Indemnity Company of America, Petitioner, 1046 vs. Board of County Commissioners of Columbiana County, Ohio, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bert W. Gearhart and Mr. George T. Farrell for the petitioner.

The Aetna Casualty & Surety Company, Petitioner, 1047 vs. Board of County Commissioners of Columbiana County, Ohio, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bert W. Gearhart and Mr. George T. Farrell for the petitioner.

Grace Pemberton, Petitioner, 1056 vs. Morris Fertilizer Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. H. King, Mr. George C. Bedell, and Mr. Roswell King for the petitioner, and by Mr. Peter O. Knight, Mr. C. Fred Thompson, and Mr. A. G. Turner for the respondent.

Morse Dry Dock & Repair Company, Petitioner, 1062 vs. John Danielson, an Infant, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles J. McDermott for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harold R. Medina for the respondent.

Morse Dry Dock & Repair Company, Petitioner, 1063 vs. Ellen S. Warren, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles J. McDermott for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harold R. Medina for the respondent.

Morse Dry Dock & Repair Company, Petitioner, 1064 vs. William J. Connelly.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles J. McDermott for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harold R. Medina for the respondent.

Benjamin F. Zucker, Petitioner, 1065 vs.

The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel S. Koenig and Mr. Elijah N. Zoline for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Edward Fox et al., Petitioners, 1071 vs. The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles B. Stafford for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Rudolph Schliefer, Petitioner, 1075 vs. The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank A. Harrigan for the petitioner.

The New York Central Railroad Company, Petitioner, 1076 vs. Florence M. Cuddeback, as Administratrix, etc. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Daniel M. Beach for the petitioner, and by Mr. Arthur E. Sutherland for the respondent.

Charles G. Binderup, Plaintiff in Error, 478 vs. Pathe Exchange (Inc.) et al. The motion to dismiss the writ of error in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Saul E. Rogers, Mr. William M. Seabury, and Mr. Arthur F. Mullen for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Irving F. Baxter, Mr. Morris Brown, and Mr. Dana B. Van Dusen for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, June 4th next, at 12 o'clock.

Monday, June 4th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

Willis Van Devanter,

James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.

Louis D. Brandeis,

George Sutherland,

Pierce Butler,

Edward T. Sanford,

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chauncey Hackett, it is ordered that Charles J. Mahoney, Esquire, of Newport, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otis Wingo, it is ordered that O. A. Cargill, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma; and Earl S. Wood, Esquire, and Sam M. Levine, Esquire, of Pine Bluff, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Keaner, it is ordered that Charles R. Loomis, Esquire, of El Paso, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, it is ordered that Samuel Blumberg, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry F. Woodard, it is ordered that William Harden Keith, Esquire, of Doniphan, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor

of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander H. Clark, it is ordered that George J. Gulotta, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert P. Beyer, it is ordered that Abraham Hugo Rubenstein, Esquire, and Sam L. Cohen, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John T. Barnett, it is ordered that Joseph Cromwell Sampson, Esquire, and Harold D. Roberts, Esquire, of Denver, and Harry Behm, Esquire, of Brighton, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson, it is ordered that A. K. Hunt, Esquire, of Sherman, Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Prentiss, it is ordered that Leonard H. Shipman, Esquire, of Troy, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Evan J. Foulds, it is ordered that Alan C. Van Fleet, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Andrew Wilson, it is ordered that Lloyd T. Everett, Esquire, and F. I. Brown, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Madera Sugar Pine Company, Plaintiff
in Error,
235 vs.

Industrial Accident Commission
of the State of California and
Geronima Venegas, by Joseph
Barcroft, her attorney in fact.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Madera Sugar Pine Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
296 vs.
Industrial Accident Commission
of the State of California et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Willard, Sutherland & Company,
Appellant,
209 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

William C. Atwater and Company,
Inc.,
Appellant,
218 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Georgia Railway & Power Company, Georgia Railway & Electric Company, R. C. Hackman, et al., Plaintiffs in Error, 463 vs. The Town of Decatur. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Georgia Railway & Electric Power Company, Georgia Railway & Electric Power Company, R. C. Hackman, et al., Plaintiffs in Error, 463 vs. The Town of Decatur. — On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Georgia Railway & Power Company, Georgia Railway & Electric Company, J. D. Malsby, et al., Plaintiffs in Error, 464 vs. The Mayor and Council of the City of College Park. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this

Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Georgia Railway & Power Company, Georgia Railway & Electric Company, J. D. Malsby, et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
464 vs.
The Mayor and Council of the City of College Park.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Brush Electric Company, Appellant,
179 vs.
The City of Galveston, H. O. Sappington, as Mayor-President of the City of Galveston, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Complainant,
24, Orig'l. vs.
A. W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on motion to dismiss, and was argued by counsel.
On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the bill of complaint herein be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Harriet A. Frothingham, Appellant,
962 vs.

Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the
Treasury, et al.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad
Company, Appellant,
724 vs.
R. A. Daughton, Commissioner of
Revenue of the State of North
Carolina, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Norfolk Southern Railroad Company,
Appellant,
727 vs.
R. A. Daughton, Commissioner of
Revenue, and James S. Manning,
Attorney General of the State of
North Carolina.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Appellant,
744 vs.
R. A. Daughton and R. A. Daughton, as Commissioner of Revenue of the State of North Carolina, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Southern Railway Company, Appellant,
766 vs.
R. A. Daughton and R. A. Daughton, as Commissioner of Revenue of the State of North Carolina, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Charles Glen Collins, Appellant,
860 vs.
Victor Leisel, United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

The opinion in this cause on the judgment entered on May 4, 1923, was delivered by Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Houston Coal Company, Plaintiff in Error,
365 vs.
The United States of America.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The First National Bank of San Jose, Plaintiff in Error,
276 vs.
The State of California and U. S. Webb, Attorney General, et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The United States of America, Appellant,
307 vs.
American Linseed Oil Company, American Linseed Company, Ankeny Linseed Manufacturing Company, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois,

and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with instructions to issue an injunction as prayed by the original bill and promptly to take any further action necessary to carry the opinion of this Court into effect.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Robert T. Meyer, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Nebraska. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

325

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes,
Mr. Justice Sutherland.

August Bartels, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Iowa. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

134

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes,
Mr. Justice Sutherland.

H. H. Bohning, Plaintiff in Error, In Error to the Supreme Court of the
181 vs. State of Ohio.
The State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes,
Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Emil Pohl, Plaintiff in Error, In Error to the Supreme Court of the
182 vs. State of Ohio.
The State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes,
Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Nebraska District of Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and other States, et al., In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.
Plaintiffs in Error,
440 vs.
Samuel R. McKelvie, Clarence A. Davis, Otto F. Walter, and their

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause as to Samuel R. McKelvie and Clarence A. Davis, formerly Governor and Attorney General, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

It is further ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, as to Otto F. Walter, County Attorney, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes,
Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Ex parte In the matter of The United States, Owner, etc., Petitioner. ---, Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus and/or a writ of prohibition herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and that a rule to show cause issue returnable on Monday, October 1st next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of Henry Woodhouse, Petitioner. ---, Original.

On consideration of the motions for leave to file petitions for a writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Wichita Railroad & Light Company, Appellant, vs. The Public Utilities Commission of the State of Kansas, et al.

On consideration of the motion to recall the mandate in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The City of Newark, Plaintiff in Error,
469 vs.
The State of New Jersey.

On consideration of the motion to stay the mandate in this cause pending the petition for rehearing,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Guaranty Title & Trust Corporation, Receiver of Vue de L'Eau Company, Appellant,
552 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion of Norfolk Hampton Roads Company for leave to intervene as a party appellee in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; the appellant to give bond in the amount of $3,000.00, to be approved by the Clerk of this Court, bond to run in the name of The United States for the benefit of the Norfolk Hampton Roads Company to secure the payment of costs of the appeal as well as interest on $33,000.00, constituting that part of the judgment recovered by the Norfolk Hampton Roads Company, payment of which has been withheld in consequence of the appeal.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lion Bonding & Surety Company, Petitioner,
574 vs.
A. H. Karatz.
Department of Trade and Commerce of the State of Nebraska et al., Petitioners,
467 vs.
A. J. Hertz et al., etc., Receivers, etc.

On consideration of the motion to modify the decree heretofore entered in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Galveston Causeway Construction Company et al., Petitioners,
995 vs.
Galveston, Harrisburg & San Antonio Railway Company et al.

It is ordered by this Court that the per curiam opinion announced in this cause on Monday, April 30th last, be, and the same is hereby, modified by striking out all therein contained after the words "The petition for certiorari in this case is denied," for the reason that the criticism of the petitioner for failure to file a statement in accordance with

paragraph 3 of rule 37 was undeserved.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of Jesse C. Rumsey, Petitioner. ---, Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Appellant,
1036 vs.
Roger B. Wood, Trustee in Bankruptcy, etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Appellant,
1073 vs.
New York Coffee & Sugar Exchange, Inc., et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 12th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dayton-Goose Creek Railway Company, Appellant,
1072 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 12th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Peoria & Pekin Union Railway Company, Appellant,
1044 vs.
The United States of America et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 12th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, as Agent, etc., Plaintiff in Error, vs. W. M. Scroggins. — In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

876

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles G. Binderup, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Pathe Exchange, Inc., et al. — It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

478

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Erie Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Martin Kirkendall. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals, Eighth Judicial District of the State of Ohio.

1018

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals, Eighth Judicial District of the State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Great Northern Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Galbreath Cattle Company et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana.

1031

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner,
1035 vs.
R. L. Hanna.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Clarence D. Keller et al., etc., Petitioners,
1039 vs.
Adams-Campbell Company, Inc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Bromwell Brush & Wire Goods Company, Plaintiff in Error,
887 vs.
The State Board of Charities and Corrections of Kentucky.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Albert Bickel, Bankrupt, Petitioner,
964 vs.
A. Robinson, Trustee of the Estate of Albert Bickel, Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to

the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. L. Lancaster et al., Receivers of Texas & Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Ben E. Fitch. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas.

1005

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Lilley Building & Loan Company, Petitioner, vs. Newton M. Miller, as Collector, etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

1033

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jacques Rousso, Petitioner, vs. First National Bank in Detroit et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

1034

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. S. Swanson et al., Petitioners, vs. Jack Sarja. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

1038

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the

Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
1040 vs.
Giuseppe Ganci.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Farmers' Loan & Trust Company of New York, Petitioner,
1043 vs.
Wilcox County, Georgia.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The London & Lancashire Indemnity Company of America, Petitioner,
1046 vs.
Board of County Commissioners of Columbiana County, Ohio, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Aetna Casualty & Surety Company, Petitioner,
1047 vs.

of Columbiana County, Ohio, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Goldwyn Pictures Corporation et al., Petitioners, vs. Howells Sales Company et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

1053

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Grace Pemberton, Petitioner, vs. Morris Fertilizer Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

1056

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Morse Dry Dock & Repair Company, Petitioner, vs. John Danielson, an Infant, etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

1062

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Morse Dry Dock & Repair Company, Petitioner, 1063 vs. Ellen S. Warren, Administratrix of Francis J. Warren, deceased. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Morse Dry Dock & Repair Company, Petitioner, 1064 vs. William J. Connelly. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Benjamin F. Tucker, Petitioner, 1065 vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward Fox et al., Petitioners, 1071 vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Rudolph Schliefer, Petitioner,
1075 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The New York Central Railroad Company, Petitioner,
1076 vs.
Florence M. Cuddeback, as Administratrix, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company of Texas, Petitioner,
1077 vs.
John Hosey.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Sixth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Sixth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel. The Baldwin Company, Appellant,
918 vs.
Thomas E. Robertson, Commissioner of Patents.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the case on the appeal.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,

965 vs.
Mrs. T. V. Prude.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the case on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

T. R. Bennett, Superintendent of Banks for the State of Georgia, Petitioner,
1045 vs.
John E. Schwarz et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied, for lack of a final decree.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Willis A. Murray, Petitioner,
1060 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied; and that the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause be, and the same is hereby, granted as to costs incurred.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Maynard Harlan,
Appellant,
543 vs.
James S. Harlan.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
18, Orig'l. vs.
State of Texas, Defendant;

The United States, Intervener.

The commissioners heretofore designated herein to run, locate and mark portions of the boundary between the States of Texas and Oklahoma on and along the south bank of Red River are hereby ordered and directed also to survey and run upon the ground and to delineate upon a suitable plat the medial line between such state boundary and the northerly bank of such river for a total length of three miles at and in the vicinity of the river bed oil wells. In so surveying, running and platting such medial line the commissioners shall conform to the fifth paragraph of the decree entered herein March 12, 1923, entitled, "Supplement to Partial Decree of June 5, 1922," and shall ascertain and show on such plat the exact location of all oil wells which are within three hundred feet of such medial line. The commissioners shall make a separate report of their action under this order, and shall include therein a statement of the time employed and the expenses incurred in that work. The work and report of the commissioners hereunder shall be subject to the approval of the Court. Copies of the report shall be promptly delivered to the two States and the United States, and exceptions or objections thereto, if there be such, on the part of either State, the United States or any private intervener herein, shall be presented to the Court, or, if it be not in session, filed with the Clerk, within forty days after the report is made. The cost of executing this order shall be borne and paid as part of the expenses of the receivership.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

ORDER.

The Court will adjourn for the Term on Monday, June 11th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Complainant,
--- Orig'l. vs.
The State of Minnesota.
Wheat for the complainant.

The motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred A.

The United States, Complainant,
--- Orig'l. vs.
The State of Oklahoma.
Wheat for the complainant.

The motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred A.

Thomas D. McCarthy, United States Marshal, Appellant, 404 vs. Jules W. Arndstein.	On motion of Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the appellant, leave was granted to present petition for rehearing within sixty days.
The United States of America, Owner, etc., Petitioner, 1085 vs. Morris E. Henderson et al., etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, Mr. Solicitor General Beck, and Mr. F. R. Conway for the petitioner, and by Mr. Otto Wolff, Jr., for the respondents.
The United States of America, Owner, etc., Petitioner, 1086 vs. Morris E. Henderson et al., etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, Mr. Solicitor General Beck, and Mr. F. R. Conway for the petitioner, and by Mr. Otto Wolff, Jr., for the respondents.
The United States of America, Owner, etc., Petitioner, 1087 vs. Morris E. Henderson et al., etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, Mr. Solicitor General Beck, and Mr. F. R. Conway for the petitioner, and by Mr. Otto Wolff, Jr., for the respondents.
The United States of America, Owner, etc., Petitioner, 1088 vs. Morris E. Henderson et al., etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, Mr. Solicitor General Beck, and Mr. F. R. Conway for the petitioner, and by Mr. Otto Wolff, Jr., for the respondents.
The United States of America, Owner, etc., Petitioner, 1089 vs. Morris E. Henderson et al., etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, Mr. Solicitor General Beck, and Mr. F. R. Conway for the petitioner, and by Mr. Otto Wolff, Jr., for the respondents.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner,
1079 vs.
The Mennen Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. W. H. Fuller, and Mr. Adrien F. Busick for the petitioner, and by Mr. Gilbert H. Montague for the respondent.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
18, Orig'l. vs,
The State of Texas, Defendant;
The United States, Intervenor.

Leave was granted Mr. Alfred A. Wheat to file suggestion herein on or before Wednesday next.

Eighth Avenue Railroad Company,
Appellant,
656 vs.
Job E. Hedges, as Receiver, etc.

The motion to dismiss this appeal was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter Howe and Mr. Bronson Winthrop for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. Michel Kirtland for the appellant in opposition thereto.

Ninth Avenue Railroad Company,
Appellant,
657 vs.
Job E. Hedges, as Receiver, etc.

The motion to dismiss this appeal was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter Howe and Mr. Bronson Winthrop for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. Michel Kirtland for the appellant in opposition thereto.

McLane Tilton, Appellant,
87 vs.
Felix M. Drennen, as Receiver, etc.

The stipulation to reinstate this appeal and to reverse on confession of error was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Forney Johnston in that behalf.

R. Lee Makely, Trading as Makely Motor Company, Plaintiff,
---, Orig'l. vs.
Victor P. Gauthey et al.

The motion for leave to file declaration in assumpsit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lloyd T. Everett and Mr. Frank I. Brown for the plaintiff.

Lnay Tom, nee Bigpamd, et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
907 vs.
C. C. Mills.

The motion to dismiss the writ of error herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ray S. Fellows for the defendant in error in support of the motion.

First National Bank in St. Louis, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State of Missouri at the information of Jesse W. Barrett, Attorney General.

919

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Otto Schlebohm in behalf of counsel.

J. W. Russell, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
James E. Seargeant, Trustee in Bankruptcy for Prentiss Tucker, Bankrupt.

1114

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

Mr. Joseph W. Cox, of counsel for the defendant in error, having filed in open Court the following certificate, to wit:

"I, C. S. Reinhart, Clerk of the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, hereby certify that on the 15th day of August, 1920, a writ of error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington was allowed by the Hon. O. R. Holcomb, Chief Justice of said Supreme Court, to remove said cause to the Supreme Court of the United States; that said writ of error was allowed at the instance of J. W. Russell, respondent in said cause:

That in pursuance of the order allowing said writ of error a bond in the sum of $500 as security for cost was duly filed, and that on the 14th day of September, 1920, a full, true and correct transcript of so much of the record in said cause as I was required by praecipe, together with the original writ of error and original citation, was duly sent to the Clerk of the United States Supreme Court, at Washington, D. C., and further deponent sayeth not.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of said Court, this 28th day of March, 1923.

(Signed) C. S. REINHART, Clerk",

and moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the ninth rule.

And it appearing to the Court that the plaintiff in error has failed to have his cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court,

It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, be, and the

same is hereby, docketed and dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Railway Express Company, Petitioner,
424 vs.
Lucius P. Loree.

The motion to dismiss the writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash in behalf of Mr. Charles T. Wortham for the respondent in support of the motion, and by Mr. Hunter C. Leake and Mr. A. M. Hartung for the petitioner in opposition thereto.

Railroad Commission of the State of California, Petitioner,
984 vs.
Southern Pacific Company et al.;
Railroad Commission of the State of California, Petitioner,
985 vs.
The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company; and
Railroad Commission of the State of California, Petitioner,
986 vs.
Los Angeles & Salt Lake Railroad Company.

The motions to advance these cases were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash in behalf of counsel for the petitioner.

National Association of Window Glass Manufacturers et al., Appellants,
1111 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash in behalf of Mr. John W. Davis for the appellants.

William Randall et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
274 vs.
The Board of Commissioners of Tippecanoe County, Indiana.

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of error to the Appellate Court of the State of Indiana was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash in behalf of counsel.

The United States of America ex rel. Joseph Feld, etc., Petitioner,
1105 vs.
Robert L. Bullard, Major General, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. B. B. Pettus and Mr. E. F. Golladay for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the respondent.

Union Stock Yards Company of Omaha, Ltd., Plaintiff in Error,
409 vs.
Mayhall & Neible et al., etc.

The motion to reinstate the petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. B. B. Pettus in that behalf.

Benjamin Gitlow, Plaintiff in Error,
770 vs.
The People of the State of New York.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. B. B. Pettus in that behalf.

The United States of America ex rel. The Baldwin Company, Appellant,
918 vs.
Thomas E. Robertson, Commissioner, etc.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel S. Watson for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. John E. Cross, Mr. John S. Flannery and Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for the appellant in opposition thereto.

National Surety Company, Petitioner,
1067 vs.
Edward H. Childs, Trustee in Bankruptcy, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William J. Griffin, Mr. George Pfeil, and Mr. Frank M. White for the petitioner, and by Mr. Moses Cohen for the respondent.

James K. Cochran and Harris Kobey, Plaintiffs in Error,
498 vs.
Coulton M. Becker.

The motion to rescind judgment and for stay of mandate in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harris Kobey pro se.

The United States of America ex rel. Catoni Tisi, alias Linta Cortina, Appellant, 640 vs. Robert E. Tod, Commissioner of Immigration, etc.

The motion to reinstate this case on the docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Isaac Shorr for the appellant.

Kansas City Southern Railway Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error, 955 vs. Road Improvement District No. 3 of Sevier County, Arkansas, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. F. Taliaferro for the plaintiffs in error in support of the petition.

Thomas A. Delaney, Petitioner, 1113 vs. The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Michael M. Doyle and Mr. Laurence M. Finn for the petitioner.

Merl B. Inks, Petitioner, 1112 vs. The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. P. H. Macaulay for the petitioner.

W. J. Blair, Plaintiff in Error, --- vs. F. Rorer's Administrator et al.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Aubrey E. Strode for the petitioner.

James C. Davis, Agent, etc., Petitioner, 1054 vs. J. M. Curris.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas W. Davis and Mr. Douglas McKay for the petitioner.

James C. Davis, Agent, etc., Petitioner, 1059 vs. John O'Hara.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. A. McLaughlin, Mr. N. H. Loomis, and Mr. C. A. Magaw for the petitioner, and by Mr. Benjamin S. Baker for the respondent.

Simon A. Miller, Petitioner,
1066 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph H. Stewart for the petitioner.

William B. Moses, Petitioner,
1069 vs.
Laline & Partridge (Inc.) et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic P. Warfield for the petitioner, and by Mr. Marcus B. May for the respondents.

Sunrise Pictures Corporation, Petitioner,
1078 vs.
Isaac Silverman.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Joseph Lilly for the petitioner, and by Mr. Joseph B. Kaufman for the respondent.

Herman C. Gerdes, as Trustee in Bankruptcy, etc., Petitioner,
1082 vs.
Abraham Lustgarten.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Moses Cohen for the petitioner.

The Sandusky Cement Company, Petitioner,
1093 vs.
A. B. Hamilton & Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alton C. Dustin and Mr. C. M. Horn for the petitioner.

Jose Toya's Sons Company, Claimant, etc., Petitioner,
1101 vs.
Jean B. M. Duche et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John M. Woolsey and Mr. Robert S. Erskine for the petitioner, and by Mr. D. Roger Englar and Mr. T. Catesby Jones for the respondents.

Mary E. McCampbell, Petitioner,
1094 vs.
New York Life Insurance Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Hal Browne and Mr. Henry P. Burney for the petitioner.

The People of the State of New York, Petitioner,

1110 vs.

Louis Jerzawit, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Ajax Dress Company (Inc.).

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert P. Boyer and Mr. C. T. Dawes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harry D. Singer for the respondent.

Locomotive Stoker Company, Petitioner,

1098 vs.

The Elvin Mechanical Stoker Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, Mr. Louis K. Gillson, and Mr. Paul Synnestvedt for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. Snowden Bell, Mr. Drury W. Cooper, and Mr. Frederick P. Whitaker for the respondent.

Adams Express Company, Plaintiff in Error,

865 vs.

W. W. Darden.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. B. Laurent, Mr. John A. Pitts, and Mr. K. T. McConnico for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. William L. Granbery for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Joseph Phipps et al., Petitioners,

835 vs.

Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, costs to be paid by the respondent.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, etc., Plaintiff in Error,

1091 vs.

Michael J. Hanlon.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. J. Hillegass and William H. Miller, Petitioners, 967 vs. Bertha Rohm, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jo V. Morgan for the petitioners, and by Mr. A. J. Hillegass, pro se.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, June 11th next, at 12 o'clock.

Monday, June 11th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

Willis Van Devanter,

James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.

Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,

Edward T. Sanford,

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Adrien F. Busick, it is ordered that Henry Miller, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that Allan G. Ritter, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Bruce L. Casteel, it is ordered that Willis M. Isbell, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otis Wingo, it is ordered that R. H. L. Allen, Esquire, of Morgantown, State of West Virginia; and Karl Greenhaw, Esquire, of Harrison, and Arthur L. Smith, Esquire, of Silcam Springs, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otto A. Schlobohm, it is ordered that W. H. Caldwell, Esquire, of Wichita Falls, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, it is ordered that Perry V. Hammon, Esquire, Everett W. Mattoon, Esquire, Lawrence C. Cobb, Esquire, Gertrude R. Chamberlin, and Harry A. Chamberlin, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California; and Burton R. Cole, Esquire, of Lewistown, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James W. Witten, it is ordered that Benjamin M. Stansbury, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, and George Williams, Esquire, of Rapid City, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, it is ordered that Charles Fertsch, Esquire, of Hallettsville, and Sarah Cory Menefee, of Dallas, State of Texas; and William J. Mead, Esquire, of Fremont, and L. I. Litzler, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, it is ordered that J. Sherman Lilly, Esquire, and P. H. Camp, Esquire, of Charleston, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George M. McClellan, it is ordered that Anthony Yuen Seto, Esquire, of Honolulu, Hawaii, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Ridge Company et al.,

Plaintiffs in Error, In Error to the District Court of Appeal, of the Second Appellate District,

237 vs. State of California.

County of Los Angeles.

Ridge Company, Plaintiff in Error,

vs.

County of Los Angeles.

These causes came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of Appeal of the State of California, and were argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgments of the said District Court of Appeal in these causes be, and the same are hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

(Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of these cases).

Mary L. Milheim, Frederick A. Metcalf, Torrence White, Sr., et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
791 vs.
The Moffat Tunnel Improvement District, W. P. Robinson, Charles J. Wheeler, et al., etc.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Bluefield Water Works and Improvement Company, Plaintiff in Error,
256 vs.
Public Service Commission of the State of West Virginia et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court of Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Concurring:
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Bluefield Water Works and Improvement Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Public Service Commission of the State of West Virginia et al.

256

On consideration of the motion to dismiss the writ of error in this cause, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The City National Bank of El Paso, Texas, Petitioner, vs. El Paso & Northeastern Railroad Company et al.

309

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Eighth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals for the Eighth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Civil Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Joslin Manufacturing Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. City of Providence, Walter L. Clarke, as City Treasurer, R. Thomas Potter, et al., etc.

219

In Error to the Superior Court of the State of Rhode Island.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court of the State of Rhode Island, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Superior Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Scituate Light & Power Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. City of Providence, Walter L. Clarke, as City Treasurer, R. Thomas Potter, et al., etc.

220

In Error to the Superior Court of the State of Rhode Island.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court of the State of Rhode Island, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Superior Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Theresa B. Joslin, Plaintiff in Error, — In Error to the Superior Court of the State of Rhode Island.

221 vs.

City of Providence, Walter L. Clarke, as City Treasurer, B. Thomas Potter, et al., etc.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court of the State of Rhode Island, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Superior Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Georgia Railway and Power Company and Atlanta Gas Light Company, Appellants, — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

298 vs.

Railroad Commission of the State of Georgia, C. M. Candler, Chairman, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Lion Bonding & Surety Company, Petitioner,

574 vs.

A. H. Karatz; and

Department of Trade and
Commerce of the State of
Nebraska et al.,
Petitioners,
467 vs.
A. J. Hertz et al., etc.,
Receivers, etc.

The opinion on motion to modify decree heretofore denied was delivered by Mr. Justice Brandeis.

American Bank & Trust Company et al., Appellants, 717 vs. Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Farmers and Merchants Bank of Monroe, North Carolina, et al., Petitioners, 823 vs. Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond, Virginia.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings

not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Van Devanter,

Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Kentucky Finance Corporation, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Paramount Auto Exchange Corporation. 17

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Brandeis,

Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Complainant, vs. The State of West Virginia; and The State of Ohio, Complainant, vs. The State of West Virginia. 15, Orig'l. 16, Orig'l.

These suits having been heretofore submitted on the pleadings and the evidence, and the court being now fully advised in the premises, it is considered, ordered, and decreed as follows:

1. That the Act passed by the Legislature of the defendant State February 10, 1919, which is set forth in the bills of complaint in these suits and known as Chapter 71 of the West Virginia Acts of 1919, is a void and inoperative enactment because it contravenes the limitations which the Constitution of the United States places upon State action in respect of commerce among the several States;

2. That the defendant State and her several officers, agents, and servants are hereby severally enjoined from enforcing or attempting to enforce

that Act;

3. That the aggregate costs in these suits be apportioned among and paid by the parties thereto as follows: The State of West Virginia, one-half; the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, one-fourth; and the State of Ohio, one-fourth.

4. That Levi Cooke, Esquire, the Commissioner by whom the evidence in these suits was taken and reported to this Court, shall receive and be paid the sum of six thousand dollars in full compensation for the services rendered and the expenses incurred by him in that connection, and that this sum be taxed as part of the aggregate costs in the two suits and be paid by the parties in the proportions just named;

5. That the Clerk of this Court transmit to the Chief Magistrates of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the States of Ohio and West Virginia copies of this decree only, authenticated under the seal of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes,
Mr. Justice McReynolds,
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Sonneborn Brothers, a firm composed of Ferdinand Sonneborn, Sigmund B. Sonneborn, and Julius Roten, Appellants,
20 vs.
C. M. Cureton, Attorney General of the State of Texas, and Mark L. Wiggington, Comptroller of the State of Texas.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Concurring: Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Charles Wolff Packing Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Court of Industrial Relations of the State of Kansas. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

739

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

The United States, Complainant, ---, Orig'l. vs. The State of Minnesota. On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and process is ordered to issue returnable on Monday, October 1st next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Complainant, --- Orig'l. vs. The State of Oklahoma. On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

R. Lee Makely, Trading as Makely Motor Company, Plaintiff, ---, Original. vs. Victor P. Gauthey and M. Emma Gauthey. On consideration of the motion for leave to file a declaration in assumpsit herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that cause be shown by R. Lee Makely, Trading as Makely Motor Company, before this Court, at the City of Washington, on Monday, October 1st next, or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, why he should be permitted to begin in this Court the action of assumpsit.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. J. Blair, Plaintiff in Error,
--- vs.
F. Horer's Administrator et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of error herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Randall et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
274 vs.
The Board of Commissioners of Tippecanoe County, Indiana.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of error herein to the Appellate Court of the State of Indiana,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Union Stock Yards Company of Omaha, Plaintiff in Error,
409 vs.
Mayhall & Neible et al., etc.

On consideration of the motion to reinstate petition for a writ of certiorari herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James K. Cochran and Harris Kobey, Plaintiffs in Error,
498 vs.
Coulton M. Becker.

On consideration of the motion to rescind the judgment, and for a stay of the mandate, herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel. Catani Tisi, alias Lista Cortina, Appellant,
640 vs.
Robert E. Tod, Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of New York.

On consideration of the motion to reinstate this case on the docket,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

McLane Tilton, Appellant,
87 vs.
Felix M. Drennen, as Receiver, etc.

On consideration of the stipulation to reinstate this cause on the docket and to reverse on confession of error,

It is now here ordered that said cause be reinstated on the docket; and that the decree be reversed upon such confession of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

First National Bank in St. Louis,
Plaintiff in Error,
919 vs.
The State of Missouri, at the information of Jesse W. Barrett, Attorney General.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 12th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Railroad Commission of the State of California, Petitioner,
984 vs.
Southern Pacific Company et al.
Railroad Commission of the State of California, Petitioner,
985 vs.
The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company.
Railroad Commission of the State of California, Petitioner,
986 vs.
Los Angeles & Salt Lake Railroad Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, November 12th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

National Association of Window Glass Manufacturers, et al.,
Appellants,
1111 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 12th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Benjamin Gitlow, Plaintiff in Error,
770 vs.
The People of the State of New York.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 12th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Eighth Avenue Railroad Company, Appellant,
555 vs.
Job E. Hedges, as Receiver of the New York Railways Company.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ninth Avenue Railroad Company, Appellant,
557 vs.
Job E. Hedges, as Receiver of the New York Railways Company.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lucy Tom, nee Bigpond, et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
907 vs.

C. C. Mills.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Railway Express Company,
Petitioner,
424 vs.
Lucius P. Loves.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Adams Express Company, Plaintiff in Error,
865 vs.
W. W. Darden.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, as Agent, etc.,
Petitioner,
1054 vs.
J. M. Currie.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Agent, etc.,
Petitioner,
1059 vs.
John O'Hara.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Herman G. Gerdes, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Abraham Lustgarten, Bankrupt, Petitioner, vs. Abraham Lustgarten. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

1082

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The People of the State of New York, Petitioner, vs. Louis Jerosawit, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Ajax Dress Company, Inc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

1110

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas A. Delaney, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

1115

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. J. Hillegas, et al., Petitioners, vs. Bertha Rohm, Administratrix of M. J. Rohm, deceased. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

967

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Simon Miller, Petitioner,
1066 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

National Surety Company,
Petitioner,
1067 vs.
Edward H. Childs, Trustee in Bankruptcy of J. Menist Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William B. Moses, Petitioner,
1069 vs.
Lelime & Partridge, Inc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sunrise Pictures Corporation,
Petitioner,
1078 vs.
Isaac Silverman.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
1079 vs.
The Monsen Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United States of America,
Owner of the Steamship Anna E. Morse,
Petitioner,
1085 vs.
Morris E. Henderson et al.,
Trading as Phoenix Paint & Varnish Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United States of America,
Owner of the Steamship
Colin H. Livingstone,
Petitioner,
1086 vs.
Morris E. Henderson et al.,
Trading as Phoenix Paint & Varnish Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to

the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Owner of the Steamship Jennie R. Morse, Petitioner,
1087 vs.
Morris E. Henderson et al., Trading as Phoenix Paint & Varnish Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Owner of the Steamship E. A. Morse, Petitioner,
1088 vs.
Morris E. Henderson et al., Trading as Phoenix Paint & Varnish Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United States of America,
Owner of the Steamship H. F. Morse, Petitioner,
1089 vs.
Morris E. Henderson et al., Trading as Phoenix Paint & Varnish Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Sandusky Cement Company, Petitioner, vs. A. R. Hamilton & Company. 1093

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mary E. McCampbell, Petitioner, vs. New York Life Insurance Company. 1094

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Locomotive Stoker Company, Petitioner, vs. Elvin Mechanical Stoker Company. 1098

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jose Taya's Sons Company, Claimant of the steamship

"Asuarca", etc., Petitioner,
1101 vs.
Jean B. M. Duche et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel.
Joseph Feld, by next friend, Samuel Feld, Petitioner,
1105 vs.
Robert L. Bullard, Major General, United States Army.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Merl B. Inks, Petitioner,
1112 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kansas City Southern Railway Company, et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
955 vs.
Road Improvement District No. 3 of Sevier County, Arkansas, et al.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas, Defendant; The United States, Intervener. 18, Orig'l.

On consideration of the motion of the United States for a release from the existing receivership of the following-described lands lying on the North side of the medial line of Red River, that is to say:

(1) Lot 4 of Section 34 in Township 4 South of Range 14 West embraced in allotment No. 3385, Comanche, 1910, to Day Tah-Too-Ah-Ni-Pah;

(2) Lot 1 of Section 33 in Township 4 South of Range 14 West embraced in allotment No. 3303, Kiowa, 1910, to Ray Do-Yah;

(3) Lot 6 of Section 5 in Township 5 South of Range 14 West embraced in allotment No. 3293, Kiowa, 1910, to Maggie Turtle Mountain Reid; and

(4) Lot 5 of Section 5 and lot 3 of Section 8 in Township 5 South of Range 14 West embraced in allotment No. 3413, Comanche, 1910, to Robert To-Quothy,

It is ordered as to each of these tracts that the same, including so much of the bed of Red River as lies in front thereof and North of the medial line of the river, be released from the receivership and the possession be surrendered by the Receiver upon fulfillment as to such tract of the following conditions, and not otherwise:

(a) The execution and presentation to the Receiver of satisfactory agreements, approved by the Secretary of the Interior, establishing the side lines from the surveyed upland on the North bank to such medial line between such tract and the adjoining tracts on either side; and

(b) That the payment to the Receiver of such sum or balance as may at the time be owing to the Receiver on account of oil wells (whether productive or otherwise) drilled or completed on such tract and within such side lines under the supervision or administration of the Receiver -- such sum or balance to include all expenditures and advancements of the Receiver, whether for materials, labor, receivership expenses, or otherwise, in respect of such wells.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

ORDER.

In the cases in which opinions have been handed down today, as follows, to wit: Nos. 237, 791, 256, 309, 219, 220, 221, 298, 467, 574, 717, 823, 17, 15 and 16, Original, 20, 739, ten days shall elapse before the mandates go down; and leave is given to the parties to file such motions within that

period as they may be advised, which shall have the same effect as if filed this day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Shooter's Island Shipyard Company,
Appellant,
--- vs.
Standard Shipbuilding Corporation;
The United States of America,
Appellant,
--- vs.
Standard Shipbuilding Corporation;
and
The United States of America,
Appellant,
--- vs.
Standard Shipbuilding Corporation.

The motion for leave to file petition for appeals in these cases to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the petitioners.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
---, Orig'l. vs.
Edwin L. Garvin, District Judge of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York.

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of prohibition or mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the petitioner.

John Connors, Plaintiff in Error,
6 vs.
The People of the State of Illinois;
Edward O'Donnell, Plaintiff in Error,
7 vs.
The People of the State of Illinois;
Leonard Banks et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
8 vs.
The People of the State of Illinois;
Frank Bender, Plaintiff in Error,
9 vs.

The People of the State of
Illinois;
John Boone, Plaintiff in Error,
10 vs.
The People of the State of
Illinois;
William Taglia, Plaintiff in
Error,
11 vs.
The People of the State of
Illinois;
Abe Schaffner, Plaintiff in
Error,
25 vs.
The People of the State of
Illinois;
George Moran, Plaintiff in
Error,
57 vs.
The People of the State of
Illinois;
David H. Conrad, Plaintiff in
Error,
241 vs.
The People of the State of
Illinois;
William F. Krell, Plaintiff in
Error,
272 vs.
The People of the State of Illinois;
Frank Dillon, Plaintiff in
Error,
537 vs.
The People of the State of Illinois;
Walter Stephens, Plaintiff in
Error,
89 vs.

The People of the State of Illinois.

The motion for leave to present petitions for rehearing within sixty days, in these cases, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Philip P. Campbell in behalf of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and the motion was denied.

Perkins Glue Company, Petitioner,
1010 vs.
The Standard Furniture Company.

The motion for leave to present petition for a rehearing at the next term was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas Ewing and Mr. Gorham Crosby for the petitioner, and the motion was denied.

ORDER.

It is now here ordered by this Court that all cases on the docket not decided and all the other business of the Term not disposed of be, and the same are hereby, continued to the next term.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned to the time and place appointed by law.

VOL

19

UME

23

Monday, October 1st, 1923.

At the Capitol of the United States, in the City of Washington, and District of Columbia, being the present seat of the National Government of the United States, on the first Monday of October (being the first day of the same month) in the year of our Lord one thousand, nine hundred and twenty-three and of the Independence of the United States the one hundred and forty-eighth, the Supreme Court of the United States met agreeably to law.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it is ordered that Andrew B. Dougherty, Esquire, of Lansing, and Alvah L. Sawyer, Esquire, of Menominee, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph T. Robinson, it is ordered that Claude Duty, Esquire, of Rogers, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward J. Herring, it is ordered that Adelbert H. Sweet, Esquire, of San Diego, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph G. Weatherly, it is ordered that Henry E. Bolt, Esquire, of Wichita Falls, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jesse B. Adams, it is ordered that Foster Wood, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Theodore A. Hostetler, it is ordered that Conder C. Henry, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, it is ordered that Joseph D. Hern, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William G. Wheeler, it is ordered that Charles Whitney Babcock, Esquire, and John M. Niven, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edmund N. Jones, it is ordered that Louis J. Cohen, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. S. Flannery, it is ordered that W. Randolph Montgomery, Esquire, of New York, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wade H. Ellis, it is ordered that Percy H. Stewart, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank B.

Kellogg, it is ordered that Clyde E. Souders, Esquire, of Wichita, State of Kansas; Louis W. Bennett, Esquire, of Berkeley, State of California; and Perry Post Taylor, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Perry W. Howard, it is ordered that William C. Todd, Esquire, of Cristobal, Canal Zone, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Lewis Smith, it is ordered that Walter A. Wade, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Watkins, it is ordered that J. Henry Doyle, Esquire, of Greenfield, State of Illinois; and Stokes V. Robertson, Esquire, and Clayton D. Potter, Esquire, of Jackson, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lawrence H. Cake, it is ordered that Albert M. Cristy, Esquire, of Honolulu, Hawaii, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. B. Denning, it is ordered that Karl F. Griffith, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry Peyton, it is ordered that E. Irving Smith, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Patrick J. M. Mally, it is ordered that Elmer H. Groefsema, Esquire, Arthur W. Kilpatrick, Esquire, and Louis Cohane, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan,

be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chapin Brown, it is ordered that William T. Sabine, Jr., Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jerry A. Mathews, it is ordered that Daniel Coleman, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George T. Buckingham, it is ordered that Stephen E. Hurley, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced that after entertaining motions for admission to the bar, and all other motions noticed for today, the Court would adjourn in order that the members of the Court might pay their respects to the President of the United States. The Court will commence the call of the docket tomorrow, pursuant to the twenty-sixth rule.

The United States of America,
Complainant,
22, Orig'l. vs.
The State of Minnesota; and
The United States of America,
Complainant,
24, Orig'l. vs.
The State of Minnesota.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck in behalf of counsel for the defendant, leave was granted defendant to file answer in these cases on or before October 29th.

Hillsboro Coal Company and Rice Miller, Appellants,
2 vs.
Edward C. Knotts, United States District Attorney for the Southern

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Illinois.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, of counsel for the appellees, and it appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed without costs to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Herman C. Perry and Indiana & Illinois Coal Corporation, Appellants,

3 vs.

Edward C. Knotts, United States District Attorney for the Southern District of Illinois, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Illinois.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, of counsel for the appellees, and it appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed without costs to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Corona Coal Company, Appellant,

42 vs.

The United States.

The motion to dismiss the appeal herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. Forney Johnston for the appellant in opposition thereto.

Title Guaranty & Trust Company et al., Executors, etc., plaintiffs in error,

46 vs.

William H. Edwards, Collector, etc.

The motion to dismiss or affirm herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. James F. Brady for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Savage Arms Corporation, Appellant,
76 vs.
The United States.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee, it is ordered that this case be passed.

Joe Hyman, Plaintiff in Error,
140 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the defendant in error, it is ordered that this case be advanced, to be consolidated with No. 45, as one case.

Federal Trade Commission, et al., Appellants,
250 vs.
Claire Furnace Company et al.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellants.

Jack Mays, Petitioner,
496 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the respondent, leave was granted counsel for the respondent to file brief in opposition to petition for a writ of certiorari herein on or before October 8th.

Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, as Owner, etc., Petitioner,
549 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the respondent, leave was granted counsel for the respondent to file brief in opposition to petition for a writ of certiorari herein on or before October 22nd.

Algional H. Rae, Claimant, etc., Petitioner,
567 vs.
The United States of America;
Charles Eugene Albury, Claimant, etc., Petitioner,
568 vs.
The United States of America; and
Charles Eugene Albury, Claimant, etc., Petitioner,
569 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the respondent, leave was granted counsel for the respondent to file brief in opposition to petitions for writs of certiorari in these cases on or before October 8th.

Justus S. Wardell, as Collector of Internal Revenue for the First District of California, Petitioner, 705, Oct.Term,1921. vs. James A. Blum et al., Executors, etc.	On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner, leave was granted to submit memorandum on motion to revoke denial of petition for writ of certiorari on or before October 15th.
The United States of America, Petitioner, 357 vs. Edward H. Childs, Trustee in Bankruptcy of J.Menist Company (Inc.).	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner, and by Mr. Moses Cohen for the respondent.
Robert E. Tod, Commissioner of Immigration, Petitioner, 392 vs. Szejna Waldman et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the petitioners.
The United States of America, Petitioner, 415 vs. James J. Johnston.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas C. Bradley for the respondent.
Charles V. Duffy, Collector, etc., Petitioner, 455 vs. The Central Railroad Company of New Jersey.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles E. Miller for the respondent.
American Chain Company, Petitioner, 535 vs. Interstate Iron & Steel Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James M. Beck and Mr. Victor Elting for the petitioner, and by Mr. Jacob Newman and Mr. Edward R.Johnston for the respondent.

William R. Rodman, United States Marshal, Petitioner,
546 vs.
Roland R. Pothier.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner, and by Mr. Davis G. Arnold for the respondent.

Edmund L. Ebert et al., Petitioners,
512 vs.
Harry P. Poston.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. P. J. M. Hally for the petitioners, and by Mr. Louis Cohane for the respondent.

Panama Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
369 vs.
Andrew Johnson.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wade H. Ellis in that behalf.

Edgar S. Appleby et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
532 vs.
The City of New York et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John A.Kratz in behalf of Mr. Charles Henry Butler and Mr. Banton Moore for the plaintiffs in error in support of the petition, and by Mr. George P. Nicholson, Mr. Charles J. Nehrbas, and Mr. William C. Cannon for the defendant in error in opposition thereto; with leave to counsel for the plaintiff in error to file the record hereafter.

Edgar S. Appleby et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
533 vs.
John T. Delaney, as Commissioner of Docks of the City of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John A.Kratz in behalf of Mr. Charles Henry Butler and Mr. Banton Moore for the plaintiffs in error in support of the petition, and by Mr. George P. Nicholson and Mr. Charles J. Nehrbas for the defendant in error in opposition thereto; with leave to counsel for the plaintiffs in error to file record hereafter.

Brooks-Scanlon Corporation,
Appellant,
367 vs.
The United States.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston for the appellant.

United Shoe Machinery Corporation, Petitioner, 427 vs. Lorenz Muther. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. M. Holcomb in behalf of Mr. Charles F. Choate, Jr., and Mr. Lucius E. Varney for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward F. McClennen for the respondent; with leave to Mr. Solicitor General Beck to file suggestions herein in behalf of the United States on or before Friday next.

Bestwall Manufacturing Company, Petitioner, 438 vs. United States Gypsum Company. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. M. Holcomb in behalf of Mr. Laurence A. Janney for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. Clyde Jones for the respondent.

Frank Truebs, Petitioner, 543 vs. The United States of America. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim for the respondent.

Continental & Commercial Trust & Savings Bank, Plaintiff in Error, 504 vs. Wilhelmina Werner et al. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash in behalf of Mr. Oliver O. Haga for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition; with leave to counsel for the plaintiff in error to file record hereafter.

Cowokochee, Plaintiff in Error, 554 vs. James A. Chapman et al. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash in behalf of Mr. Lewis C. Lawson for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition; with leave to counsel for the plaintiff in error to file record hereafter.

Empire Machinery & Supply Corporation et al., Petitioners. ---, Original. — The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus and/or a writ of prohibition and/or a writ of certiorari, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jacob Louis Morewitz for the petitioners.

Continental Insurance Company et al., Petitioners, 435 vs. Minneapolis, St.Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nathan H. Chase, Mr. M. H. Boutelle, and Mr. Lamar Hill for the petitioners, and by Mr. Henry S. Mitchell for the respondent.

The United States, Petitioner, --- Orig'l. vs. Edwin L. Garvin, United States District Judge of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York.

The motion for leave to intervene herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harvey C. McClintock in behalf of the Shooter's Island Shipyards Corporation.

Charles Boettcher et al., Receivers of the Denver & Salt Lake Railroad Company, Plaintiffs in Error, 270 vs. The Public Utilities Commission of the State of Colorado, et al.

The motion to dismiss the writ of error in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Bradley and Mr. Tison S. Dines for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Milton Smith, Mr. Charles R. Brock and Mr. Elmer L. Brock for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Walter Davis, Petitioner, 534 vs. John Barton Payne, Agent, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William R. King in behalf of Mr. William M. Cake for the petitioner, with leave to file record when printed.

Commonwealth Trust Company of Pittsburgh, Appellant, 18 vs. Max Smith et al.

On motion of Mr. William R. King in that behalf, this case was passed, per stipulation.

Twin Falls Salmon River Land & Water Company et al., Appellants, 19 vs. A. R. Caldwell et al.

On motion of Mr. William R. King in that behalf, this case was passed, per stipulation.

Gorham Manufacturing Company, Appellant, vs. State Tax Commission of the State of New York et al.	On motion of Mr. W. W. Bride in that behalf, this case was passed, per stipulation.
14	
Bass, Ratcliff & Gretton (Limited), Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State Tax Commission.	On motion of Mr. W. W. Bride in that behalf, this case was passed, per stipulation.
24	
The United States of America ex rel. St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Interstate Commerce Commission et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. W. Bride in behalf of Mr. J.R. Turney and Mr. Charles D. Drayton for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition.
398	
Clara F. Chapin, Executrix, etc., Petitioner, vs. Bartholomew A. Brickley, Trustee, etc.; and Clara F. Chapin, Executrix, etc., Petitioner, (In the matter of Codman, Fletcher & Company, Bankrupts).	The petition for writs of certiorari in these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. Irving Smith in behalf of Mr. Hollis R. Bailey for the petitioner, and by Mr. Mark M. Horblit and Mr. Jacob Wasserman for the respondent.
448	
The Illinois Central Railroad Company, Appellant, vs. The United States.	The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin Carter for the appellant.
248	
Walter Carr, Appellant, vs. A. Alexsen, Master, etc., et al.	The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry K. Wolcott for the appellant.
555	

R. Lee Makely, Trading as Makely Motor Company, Plaintiff, ---, Orig'l. vs. Victor P. Gauthey et al.

The motion for leave to file original action in assumpsit herein was dismissed without prejudice, on motion of Mr. Lloyd T. Everett for the plaintiff.

Ziang Sung Wan, Petitioner, 451 vs. The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John S. Flannery in behalf of Mr. James A. O'Shea, Mr. Charles Fahy, Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, and Mr. William C. Dennis for the petitioner.

New England Oil Corporation, Petitioner, 417 vs. Island Oil Marketing Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Harry Covington and Mr. Thomas B. Gay for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank J. Hogan, Mr. Frederick T. Kelsey, and Mr. George Bryan for the respondent.

William R. Warner & Company, Petitioner, 32 vs. Eli Lilly & Company.

On motion of Mr. R. A. Ford in that behalf, this case was passed per stipulation of counsel.

Guillermo Severino, Petitioner, 452 vs. Fabiola Severino et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Quintin Paredes and Mr. Felipe Buencamino, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. F. C. Fisher for the respondents.

W. F. Gravins, Petitioner, 570 vs. Walker D. Hines, Director General, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph Cox in behalf of Mr. Robert H. Talley for the petitioner, and by Mr. David H. Leake and Mr. Walter Leake for the respondent.

The Union Central Life Insurance Company, Petitioner, 481 vs.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ramsey

The State of Washington,
Plaintiff in Error,
366 vs.
W. C. Dawson & Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Blaine Mallan in that behalf.

Helen C. Frick, Plaintiff
in Error,
442 vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;
Helen C. Frick, Plaintiff
in Error,
443 vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;
Adelaide H. C. Frick et al.,
etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
444 vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;
and
Adelaide H. C. Frick et al.,
etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
445 vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David A. Reed in that behalf.

The State of Michigan,
Complainant,
---,Orig'l. vs.
The State of Wisconsin.

The motion for leave to file bill of complaint herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alvah L. Sawyer and Mr. Andrew B. Dougherty for the complainant.

Harriet C. Brittin,
Appellant,
202 vs.
S. E. Judan, Presiding
Justice, et al., etc.

The motion to advance this cause under the 32nd rule was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward D. Hays in that behalf.

Harriet C. Brittin,
Appellant,
202 vs.
S. E. Judan, Presiding
Justice, et al., etc.

The motion to affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur L. Oliver for the appellees in support of the motion, and by Mr. Patrick H. Cullen and Mr. T. T. Fauntleroy for the appel-
lant in opposition thereto.

The People of the State of New York, Petitioner,
352 vs.
Louis Jersawit, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Ajax Dress Company (Inc.)

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert P. Beyer in that behalf.

Ex parte In the Matter of The State of New York et al., etc., Petitioners.
--- Orig'l.

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of prohibition and/or a writ of mandamus and/or a writ of certiorari in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clarence C. Fowler for the petitioner.

Aetna Insurance Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
286 vs.
Stokes V. Robertson, State Revenue Agent of the State of Mississippi, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Watkins, Mr. R. L. McLaurin, Mr. William Thompson, Mr. Edward L. Blodgett, and Mr. Foye M. Murphy for the plaintiffs in error in support of the petition, and by Mr. Earl N. Floyd for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, as Agent, etc., Petitioner,
347 vs.
Standard Oil Company of Indiana.

The petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Herbert E. Boynton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Reuben Hatch for the respondent.

The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Petitioner,
348 vs.
Nettie A. Crouse, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Union C. DeFord for the petitioner.

W. Meiscke-Smith et al., Petitioners,
356 vs.
Justus S. Wardell, United States Collector of Internal

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Allan P. Matthew and Mr. Edward J. McCutchen for the petitioners.

The United States of America to the use and benefit of W. B. Young Supply Company, Petitioner,
360 vs.
Charles O. Stewart et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. I. N. Watson and Mr. Henry N. Ess for the petitioner.

The Banco Mexicano de Comercio e Industria et al., Appellants,
361 vs.
Deutsche Bank et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry W. Taft for the appellant in support of the petition.

Charles H. Addington, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Marvel Oil Burner Company (Inc.), Bankrupt, Petitioner,
362 vs.
Forsyth Metal Goods Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John A. Van Arsdale for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harold J. Adams for the respondent.

Sumner Iron Works, Petitioner,
363 vs.
Todd Drydock & Construction Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. E. Horan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Chauncey G. Parker, and Mr. Henry M. Ward for the respondent.

B. Fernandez & Bros., Successors, Petitioner,
365 vs.
Leonor Aylllan y Ojeda, in her own right and as Guardian ad litem, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Philip H. Jones, Mr. Frank Antonsanti, and Mr. Frederick S. Tyler for the petitioner.

Panama Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,
369 vs.
Andrew Johnson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Richard Reid Rogers for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition.

James C. Davis, Agent, Petitioner,
371 vs.
Mrs. Mary Kennedy, Administratrix of the Estate of Dave Kennedy, deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fitzgerald Hall and Mr. Frank Slemons for the petitioner, and by Mr. F. M. Bass and Mr. W. E. Norvell, Jr., for the respondent.

Harry Glassman, Petitioner,
373 vs.
Robert C. Rand, Temporary Receiver of Herman Brenner and Jacob Brenner, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Dorothy Frooks for the petitioner, and by Mr. Archibald Palmer for the respondent.

Ray E. Robinson et al.,
Petitioners,
378 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin Slade for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

James Cox Davis, as Agent designated by the President under and in pursuance of the Transportation Act of 1920, Petitioner,
379 vs.
Marion C. Slocomb, Administratrix of the Estate of Wilson M. Slocomb, deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. G. Dorety and Mr. Edwin C. Matthias for the petitioner, and by Mr. Arthur E. Griffin for the respondent.

Paul P. Glaser, Petitioner,
380 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank P. Walsh and Mr. Paul P. Glaser, p. p., for the petitioner.

Julius Conrad et al., Petitioners,
382 vs.
The Mazatlan and the Owner thereof, California & Mexico Steamship Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Donovan for the petitioners, and by Mr. Edward J. McCutchen, Mr. Farnham P. Griffiths, and Mr. Robert M. Clarke for the respondent.

Michael Heitler, Petitioner,
387 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Weymouth Kirkland for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Nathaniel Perlman, Petitioner,
388 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Weymouth Kirkland for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Mandel Greenberg, Petitioner,
389 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Weymouth Kirkland for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company, Petitioner,
390 vs.
Eva Chinn and Henry Chinn.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. O. W. Dynes and Mr. H. H. Field for the petitioner.

J. L. Lancaster et al., Receivers, etc., Petitioners,
395 vs.
R. A. Sexton, Administrator of the Estate of William T. Dunn, deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. H. Prendergast for the petitioners, and by Mr. S. P. Jones for the respondent.

Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
401 vs.
The Formica Insulation Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Drury W. Cooper and Mr. John C. Kerr for the petitioner, and by Mr. John H. Lee and Mr. J. Edgar Bull for the respondent.

He-Gon-Ah-E-Quainee, or Mrs. C. C. Clark, Frank Beaulieu, et al., Petitioners,
410 vs.
Otto H. Horn.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration ofthe Court by Mr. Webster Ballinger for the petitioners, and by Mr. John L. Erdall for the respondent.

Buhl Independent School District No.3, in Twin Falls County, Idaho, Petitioner,
413 vs.
Neighbors of Woodcraft.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fremont Wood for the petitioner, and by Mr. James H. Richards and Mr. Oliver O. Haga for the respondent.

American Mills Company, Petitioner,
414 vs.
George F. Hoffman et al., copartners, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry Uttal for the petitioners, and by Mr. John B. Doyle for the respondents.

Kathryn Sellers, Judge Juvenile Court, District of Columbia, Petitioner,
416 vs.
Willis Brown.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lewis B. Perkins and Miss Kathryn Sellers, p. p., for the petitioner.

Fox Typewriter Company, Petitioner,
418 vs.
Underwood Typewriter Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fred L. Chappell for the petitioner and by Mr. Hans v. Briesen for the respondent.

Frank F. Pels Company (Inc.), Petitioner,
422 vs.
Saxony Spinning Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. J. Parker for the petitioner, and by Mr. John M. Robinson for the respondent.

Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Petitioner,
423 vs.
Freda Groeger, Administratrix of the Estate of John C. Groeger, deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. H. Tolles for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank M. Cobb for the respondent.

Ethel V. Lanston, Petitioner,
431 vs.
Aubrey Lanston et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. M. Wampler for the petitioner.

Jules Sohnerb et al.,
Petitioners,
433 vs.
Holt Manufacturing Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Page for the petitioners.

S. M. Nixon et al.,
Petitioners,
436 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. H. Witty and Mr. J. H. Petersen for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim for the respondent.

August Pope et al.,
Petitioners,
437 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. B. B. McGinnis and Mr. John C.Bane for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Jacob Petry, Petitioner,
439 vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lowrie C. Barton for the petitioner.

Helen C. Frick, Plaintiff in Error,
442 vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Wharton Pepper and Mr. George B. Gordon for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition.

Helen C. Frick, Plaintiff in Error,
443 vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Wharton Pepper and Mr. George B. Gordon for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition.

Adelaide H. C. Frick et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
444 vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Wharton Pepper and Mr. George B. Gordon for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition.

Adelaide H. C. Frick et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
445 vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Wharton Pepper and Mr. George B. Gordon for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition.

Merrimack National Bank, Petitioner,
446 vs.
Hollis R. Bailey et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Philip N. Jones for the petitioner.

A. L. May, as Trustee in Bankruptcy, etc., Petitioner,
450 vs.
J. M. Henderson, Jr., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry G. W. Dinkelspiel for the petitioner.

R. L. Bennett & Sons, Petitioner,
462 vs.
Farmers Seed & Gin Company of Paris (Inc.).

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John M. Spellman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Tom L. Beauchamp for the respondent.

International Radio Telegraph Company, Petitioner,
465 vs.
Atlantic Communication Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick W. Winter and Mr. Drury W. Cooper for the petitioner, and by Mr. George C. Fraser for the respondent.

International Radio Telegraph Company, Petitioner,
466 vs.
Atlantic Communication Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick W. Winter and Mr. Drury W. Cooper for the petitioner, and by Mr. George C. Fraser for the respondent.

Juvenile Shoe Company (Inc.),
Petitioner,
470 vs.
Federal Trade Commission.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Paul Overton for the petitioner.

Eva Hand, Administratrix, etc., Petitioner,
474 vs.
James C. Davis, Agent, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Warren Switzler for the petitioner.

American Paper Products Company of Indiana, Petitioner,
483 vs.
Lagerloeff Trading Company (Inc.).

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward E. Gates for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. H. Hornbrook for the respondent.

Henry Fischer, Petitioner,
491 vs.
Wabash Railway Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Jerome E. Malino for the petitioner, and by Mr. Winslow S. Pierce, Mr. Lawrence Greer, and Mr. William S. Jenney for the respondent.

James C. Davis, Director General, etc., Petitioner,
495 vs.
A. E. Manry.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. M. Cunningham, Jr., and Mr. I. J. Hofmayer for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert Douglas Feagin for the respondent.

Jack Mays, Petitioner,
496 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Randolph Harrison for the petitioner.

Mitsubishi Shoji Kaisha (Ltd.),
Petitioner,
499 vs.
James C. Davis, Director General, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph Larocque for the petitioner, and by Mr. Theodore Kiendl for the respondent.

Southern Express Company, Petitioner,
500 vs.
Parks-Cramer Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John M. Robinson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hamilton C. Jones for the respondent.

Dampskibs Selsk Dannebrog, Petitioner,
501 vs.
J. Aron & Company (Inc.) et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper for the petitioner, and by Mr. Horace L. Cheyney for the respondents.

Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company of America, Petitioner,
502 vs.
Atlantic Communication Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Griggs and Mr. James R. Sheffield for the petitioner.

Walter L. Ross, Receiver, etc., Petitioner,
505 vs.
Industrial Commission of Illinois et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. E. Pope and Mr. Walter A. Eversman for the petitioner.

J. B. Simpson, Petitioner,
506 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John J. Sullivan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Sue Phillips Gates, Petitioner,
510 vs.
Maryland Casualty Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Dallas V. Halverstadt for the petitioner.

Wenborne-Karpen Dryer Company, Petitioner,
513 vs.
Cutler Dry Kiln Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William R. Rummler and Mr. Joseph B. Cotton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Drury W. Cooper for the respondent.

The Territory of Alaska,
Petitioner,
514 vs.
Annette Island Packing
Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Wickersham for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Ottinger, and Mr. Harvey B. Cox for the respondents.

Henry L. Bogart et al.,
Petitioners,
515 vs.
Southern Pacific Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Spotswood D. Bowers and Mr. Dudley F. Phelps for the petitioners, and by Mr. Arthur H. Van Brunt and Mr. Gordon M. Buck for the respondent.

Henry L. Bogart et al.,
Petitioners,
516 vs.
Southern Pacific Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Dudley F. Phelps for the petitioners, and by Mr. Arthur H. Van Brunt and Mr. Gordon M. Buck for the respondent.

E. I. du Pont de Nemours &
Company, Petitioner,
517 vs.
James C. Davis, Director General,
etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Z. B. Harrison for the petitioner.

Joseph F. Dierikx,
Petitioner,
523 vs.
James C. Davis, Federal Agent,
etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David K. Tone for the petitioner, and by Mr. Silas H. Strawn, Mr. J. Walter Dohany, Mr. J. D. Black, Mr. John A. Gavit, and Mr. Frank E. Hobson for the respondent.

Commercial Electrical
Supply Company, Petitioner,
525 vs.
W. L. Curtis, Receiver, etc.,
et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James B. McDonough and Mr. M. C. Early for the petitioner.

Nicodemus B. Hurr et al., Petitioners,
527 vs.
Everett W. Davis et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert C. Bell for the petitioner.

William M. Barrett, as President of the Adams Express Company, Petitioner,
528 vs.
Arthur H. Van Pelt.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles W. Stockton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lamar Hardy and Mr. Louis C. White for the respondent.

Mount Vernon Car Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
536 vs.
The Pressed Steel Manufacturing Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry Love Clarke for the petitioner, and by Mr. George T. Buckingham and Mr. George L. Wilkinson for the respondents.

William Joring et al., Petitioners,
538 vs.
William Leslie Harriss et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George B. Hayes for the petitioners, and by Mr. Martin W. Littleton, Mr. Charles E. Hughes, Jr., and Mr. Otis B. Kent for the respondents.

Marie Dove Williamson, Petitioner,
541 vs.
Seaboard Air Line Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward P. Buford for the petitioner.

The State of Ohio ex rel. George S. Hawke, Plaintiff in Error,
545 vs.
Robert A. Le Blond, as Presiding Judge of the Court of Common Pleas of Hamilton County, Ohio.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George S. Hawke pro se in support of the petition.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner,
547 vs.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward J.

J. C. Sheppard for the petitioner.

Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, as Owner, etc.,
549 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Cletus Keating and Mr. John M. Woolsey for the petitioner.

Sanford Coal Company,
Petitioner,
557 vs.
Wisconsin Bridge & Iron Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bruce A. Campbell, Mr. Edward C. Kramer, and Mr. Rudolph J. Kramer for the petitioner, and by Mr. Silas H. Strawn, Mr. John D. Black, and Mr. Arthur W. Fairchild for the respondent.

Sebastian Bridge District,
Petitioner,
564 vs.
Missouri Pacific Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James B. McDonough for the petitioner.

Algional H. Rae, Claimant, etc.,
Petitioner,
567 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas B. Felder, Mr. Pierre M. Brown, and Mr. Horace L. Cheyney for the petitioner.

Charles Eugene Albury,
Claimant, etc., Petitioner,
568 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas B. Felder, Mr. Pierre M. Brown, and Mr. Horace L. Cheyney for the petitioner.

Charles Eugene Albury,
Claimant, etc., Petitioner,
569 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas B. Felder, Mr. Pierre M. Brown, and Mr. Horace L. Cheyney for the petitioner.

Fullerton-Krueger Lumber Company, Petitioner,
573 vs.
Northern Pacific Railway Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Junell for the petitioner.

The Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Company, Petitioner,
578 vs.
Spencer, Kellogg & Sons (Inc.).

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William S. Jermey for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank Gibbons for the respondent.

Edward A. Rumely et al., Petitioners,
579 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter C. Noyes and Mr. Henry B. Johnson for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. LeRoy L. Hight for the respondent.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, as Agent under Section 206, Transportation Act, 1920, operating New Orleans and North Eastern Railroad, Plaintiff in Error,
8 vs.
J. J. Smith, Jr., Administrator of the Estate of Joe J. Smith, Sr., deceased.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Los Angeles Gas and Electric Corporation, Plaintiff in Error,
13 vs.
Department of Public Service of the City of Los Angeles, et al.

In Error to the District Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division One, of the State of California.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. O'Neal Sandel, as Administrator of the Personal Estate of Thelma Sandel, deceased, Plaintiff in Error,
154 vs.
The State of South Carolina.

The motion to affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel M. Wolfe for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. William M. Graydon for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Aetna Insurance Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
286 vs.
Stokes V. Robertson, State Revenue Agent of the State of Mississippi, etc.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Earl M. Floyd for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. W. H. Watkins, Mr. William Thompson, and Mr. R. L. McLaurin for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,
302 vs.
Dorothy Pugh.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,
302 vs.
Dorothy Pugh.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Indian Territory Illuminating Oil Company, Appellant,
386 vs.
Bartlesville Zinc Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Watson A. Robinson, Mr. William J. Hughes, and Mr. Charles A. Fruesuff for the appellant in support of the petition, and by Mr. Joseph B. Cotton for the appellee in opposition thereto.

Indian Territory Illuminating Oil Company, Appellant,
386 vs.
Bartlesville Zinc Company et al.

The motion to dismiss this appeal was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph B. Cotton for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. Watson B. Robinson, Mr. William J. Hughes, and Mr. Charles A. Fruesuff for the appellant in opposition thereto.

American Railway Express Company, Petitioner,
406 vs.
Santa Anna Gas Company.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Third Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered by this Court, that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James Cox Davis, as the Agent of the President, etc., Plaintiff in Error,
530 vs.
Marion C. Slocomb, Administratrix, etc.

The motion to dismiss the writ of error herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur B. Griffin for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. F. G. Dorety and Mr. Edwin C. Matthias for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, October 2nd, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. G. Gamble, it is ordered that Ben J. Gibson, Esquire, and John J. Halloran, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr.John M. Woolsey, it is ordered that John F. McCabe, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Morganston, Jr., it is ordered that Bernie Ray Stewart, Esquire, of Winston-Salem, State of North Carolina, and H. Mason Welch, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fulton M. Brylawski, it is ordered that Maurice W. Stoffer, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Thomas D. McCarthy, United
States Marshal for the
Southern District of New

404, Oct.Term,1921. vs.
Jules W. Arndstein.

On motion of Mr. John S. Flannery in behalf of Mr. W. Randolph Montgomery for National Association of Credit Men, leave was granted to file brief herein as amicus curiae.

Frank Gonsalves, Appellant,
9 vs.
Morse Dry Dock & Repair Company.

On motion of Mr. John A. Kratz in that behalf, this case was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

Auditors Contracting Company (Inc.), et al., Petitioners,
4 vs.
Foreign Trade Banking Corporation.

On motion of Mr. John M. Woolsey in that behalf, this case was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

Me-Kah-Wah-She-Tun-Kah, et al., Appellants,
520 vs.
Albert B. Fall, Secretary of the Interior, et al.

The resignation of Albert B. Fall as Secretary of the Interior was suggested; and Hubert Work, present Secretary of the Interior, was substituted as a party appellee herein, on motion of Mr. C. F. R. Ogilby in that behalf.

Luella Swartwood, as Sole Administratrix, etc., Plaintiff in Error,
1 vs.
Lehigh Valley Railroad Company.

This case was submitted by Mr. Charles C. Annabel and Mr. Frederick S. Tyler for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Riley Heath for the defendant in error.

First National Bank of Council Bluffs, Iowa, etc., Appellant,
5 vs.
J. D. Hannan, County Auditor, etc., et al.

This case was continued, per stipulation of counsel.

The American Railway Express Company, Plaintiff in Error,
7 vs.
The Commonwealth of Kentucky.

This case was submitted by Mr. Charles W. Stockton and Mr. Lawrence Maxwell for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Charles I. Dawson for the defendant in error.

Panama Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
11 vs.
James Rock.

On motion of Mr. William C. Todd in that behalf, this case was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

Board of Public Utility Commissioners of the State of New Jersey, Appellant,
15 vs.
Public Service Railway Company.

This case was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

The School District of the Borough of Greenburg,
Plaintiff in Error,
6 vs.
S. T. Lopes et al.

This case was argued by Mr. James S.Beacom for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

St. Cloud Public Service Company, Appellant,
10 vs.
City of St. Cloud.

This cause was argued by Mr. J. O. P. Wheelwright for the appellant, and by Mr. R. B. Brower for the appellee.

James A. Baker, Receiver, etc., et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
12 vs.
Karl L. Druesedow, Tax Collector of Harris County, Texas, et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Samuel B. Dabney for the plaintiffs in error, and was submitted by Mr. W. A. Keeling for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, October 3rd, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

Willis Van Devanter,

Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.

James C. McReynolds,

George Sutherland,

Pierce Butler,

Edward T. Sanford.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage, it is ordered that Maurice G. Roberts, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank B. Kellogg, it is ordered that Charles R. Fridley, Esquire, of Superior, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Will R. King, it is ordered that Eldon Paul King, Esquire, of Lexington, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl R. Chindblom, it is ordered that Harold L. Feigenholtz, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh H. Obear, it is ordered that Thomas R. Wheeler, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Webster Electric Company,
Petitioner,
93 vs.
Splitdorf Electrical Company.

On motion of Mr. W. W. Bride in that behalf, this cause was passed, per stipulation of counsel, pursuant to the 26th Rule.

The United States of America et al., Appellants,
40 vs.
Illinois Central Railroad Company et al.,
and
Wyoming Railway Company,
Appellant,
38 vs.
The United States of America et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the United States, these cases were passed pursuant to the 26th Rule.

United Shoe Machinery Corporation, Petitioner,
427 vs.
Lorenz Muther.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the United States, the leave heretofore granted the United States of America to file suggestions herein by October 8th was withdrawn.

Charles Butters et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
16 vs.
The City of Oakland et al.

This cause was submitted by Mr. C. Irving Wright and Mr. J. E. Manders for the plaintiffs in error and by Mr. James A. Johnson for the defendants in error.

Security Savings Bank,
Plaintiff in Error,
21 vs.
The State of California.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Edward J. McCutchen, Mr. Warren Olney, Jr., and Mr. A. Crawford Green for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. U. S. Webb for the defendant in error.

Pecos Water Users' Association, Appellant,
22 vs.
L. A. Surgart et al.

On motion of Mr. Fred Dennett in behalf of the appellant, this case was passed pursuant to the 26th Rule.

Des Moines National Bank, Plaintiff in Error, 17 vs. Thomas Fairweather, Mayor, etc., et al.	This cause was argued by Mr. J. G. Gamble for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Ben J. Gibson and Mr. John J. Halloran for the defendants in error.
United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, 20 vs. Leroy W. Walter.	This cause was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the plaintiff in error and was submitted by Mr. John W. Dodge for the defendant in error.
Mangum Electric Company, Appellant, 23 vs. Campbell Russell et al., individually, etc.	This case was submitted by Mr. George P. Short and Mr. C. A. Galbraith for the appellees. No brief was filed for the appellant.
Johanna Frese, Administratrix, etc., Petitioner, 27 vs. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company.	This cause was argued by Mr. John J. Parkinson for the petitioner and by Mr. M. G. Roberts for the respondent.
Director General of Railroads, Petitioner, 39 vs. Samuel Kastenbaum.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Thomas R. Wheeler for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, October 4th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

Willis Van Devanter,

James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.

Louis D. Brandeis,

George Sutherland,

Pierce Butler,

Edward T. Sanford,

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, it is ordered that John J. Brennan, Jr., Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George W. Jolly, it is ordered that Virgil M. Chapman, Esquire, of Paris, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin T. Merrick, it is ordered that Morris B. Redmann, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Patrick H. Loughran, it is ordered that Otho S. Bowling, Esquire, of New York City, and Charles E. Harrington, Esquire, of Kittanning, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry E. Hickey, it is ordered that James J. O'Byrne, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Corona Coal Company, Appellant,
42 vs.
The United States.

On motion of Mr. Alfred A.Wheat for the appellee, this case was passed to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

Harvey McConaughey, for Himself and Others, etc., Appellant,
48 vs.
J. J. Morrow, Governor, etc.

This case was submitted by Mr. Harry A. Hegarty for the appellant, and by Mr. G. H. Martin for the appellee.

Director General of Railroads, Petitioner,
39 vs.
Samuel Kastenbaum.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Thomas H. Wheeler for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. Israel G. Holender for the respondent.

F. E. Wear et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
41 vs.
Virgil W. Johnston et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Samuel Feller for the plaintiffs in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

St. Johns, N. F., Shipping Corporation, Owner, etc., Petitioner,
43 vs.
S. A. Companhia Geral Commercial do Rio de Janeiro.

This cause was argued by Mr. Clarence Bishop Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. Curtis Rouse for the respondent.

August V. Anderson, Warden, etc., Petitioner,
44 vs.
Arthur Corall.

This cause was argued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the petitioner. There was no appearance for the respondent.

John H. Brede, Appellant,
45 vs.
James M. Powers, United States Marshal, etc.; and
Joe Wyman, Plaintiff in Error,
140 vs.
The United States.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Otho S. Bowling for the appellant and plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Title Guaranty & Trust Company et al., Executors, etc., Plaintiffs in Error,

46 vs.

William H. Edwards, Collector, etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. James F. Brady for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, October 5th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George T. Buckingham, it is ordered that Peter B. Nelson, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Mabel W. Willebrandt, it is ordered that Clara Woolwine, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Noble Jones, it is ordered that Samuel W. Tannenbaum, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wayne B. Wheeler, it is ordered that Don C. McMullen, Esquire, of Tampa, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Burry, it is ordered that Guy M. Peters, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hoke Smith, it is ordered that L. D. McGregor, Esquire, and E. P. Davis, Esquire, of Warrenton, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

John A. Grogan, as Collector of Internal Revenue of the United States for the First District of Michigan,
Plaintiff in Error,
191 vs.
Bryant Walker, as Executor of the Last Will of Charles Kent, deceased.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Board of Trade of the City of Chicago et al., Petitioners,
90 vs.
E. H. Johnson, Trustee, etc.

On motion of Mr. Robert Ash in behalf of counsel, this case was passed, per stipulation of counsel, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

John Maynard Harlan,
Appellant,
104 vs.
James S. Harlan.

On motion of Mr. Robert Ash in behalf of counsel, this case was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

John A. Davis, A. W. Barrett, G. E. Reynolds, et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
430 vs.
G. G. Wardo, C. W. Rawson, W. M. Legg, et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective

parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. Trinidad, as Insular Collector, etc., Petitioner,
53 vs.
Sagrada Orden de Predicadores de la Provincia, etc.

This case was submitted by Mr. Grant T. Trent, Mr. Logan N. Rock, and Mr. F. Granville Munson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Gabriel La O for the respondent.

Hector H. Elwell, Appellant,
55 vs.
The United States.

This case was submitted by Mr. Roy D. Keehn for the appellant, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Riter, and Mr. Leroy L. Hight for the appellee.

Edwin Denby, Secretary of the Navy, etc., Plaintiff in Error,
47 vs.
George A. Berry.

This cause was argued by Mr. George Ross Hull for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Daniel Thew Wright for the defendant in error.

Wallace Benedict, as Receiver in Bankruptcy, etc., Petitioner,
49 vs.
Aaron Ratner.

This cause was argued by Mr. Selden Bacon for the petitioner, and by Mr. Louis S. Posner for the respondent.

A. Bourjois & Company (Inc.),
50 vs.
George W. Aldridge, Collector, etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. Hans von Briesen for A. Bourjois & Co. (Inc.), and was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Harry E. Knight for George W. Aldridge, Collector, etc.

Samuel Homer Woodbridge et al., Executors, etc., Appellants,
51 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Henry P. Doolittle for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Mortimer C. Rhone, it is ordered that Harry Keller, Esquire, of Bellefonte, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry A. Hegarty, it is ordered that Theodore P. C. Willis, Esquire, and Frank H. Long, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William M. Seabury, it is ordered that Dana B. Van Dusen, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wilton J. Lambert, it is ordered that Samuel Harding Lofton, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel J. Flickinger, it is ordered that Carrol Harvey Ivins, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor

of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Ross Hull, it is ordered that Samuel D. Gittig, Esquire, and Newton B. Spangler, Esquire, of Bellefonte, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Curtis, it is ordered that Harry K. Curtis, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leonidas C. Dyer, it is ordered that Felix Cordova Davila, Esquire, and Pablo Berga, Esquire, of San Juan, Porto Rico; and Pedro Guevara, Esquire, of Manila, Philippine Islands, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis M. Swink, it is ordered that J. M. Sharp, Esquire, of Reidsville, and Oscar O. Efird, Esquire, of Winston Salem, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph M. Ulman, it is ordered that G. Tyler Smith, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be aimitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward F. Colladay, it is ordered that Edward Clifford, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, and Edward T. Sherer, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. C. Garnett, it is ordered that J. A. Tellier, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania,
Complainant,
15, Orig'l. vs.
The State of West Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a rehearing in these cases,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted; and that these cases be, and the same are hereby, assigned for reargument on Monday, November 19th next, at the head of the call for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Ohio,
Complainant,
16, Orig'l. vs.
The State of West Virginia.

Shooters Island Shipyard
Company, Appellant,
--- vs.
Standard Shipbuilding Corporation.

The United States, Appellant,
--- vs.
Standard Shipbuilding Corporation.

The United States, Appellant,
--- vs.
Standard Shipbuilding Corporation.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for appeals herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States,
--- Orig'l. vs.
Edwin L. Garvin, Judge, District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of prohibition or a writ of mandamus herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of Empire Machinery & Supply Company et al., Petitioners.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus and/or prohibition and/or certiorari herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Michigan, Complainant,
--- Orig'l. vs.
The State of Wisconsin.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and that process issue returnable on Monday, January 7th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of the State of New York et al., Petitioners.
---, Orig'l.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of prohibition, mandamus or certiorari herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Trade Commission et al., Appellants,
250 vs.
Claire Furnace Company et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 3d next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Panama Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,
369 vs.
Andrew Johnson.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 3d next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Helen C. Frick, Plaintiff in Error,
442 vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
Helen C. Frick, Plaintiff in Error,
443 vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
Adelaide H. C. Frick et al., etc., Plaintiffs in Error,

444 vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Adelaide H. C. Frick et al.,
etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
445 vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the motion to advance these causes, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the causes assigned for argument on Monday, December 3d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The People of the State of New York, Petitioner,
352 vs.
Louis Jersawit, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Ajax Dress Co., Inc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 3d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Brooks-Scanlon Corporation,
Appellant,
367 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 7th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Washington,
Plaintiff in Error,
366 vs.
W. C. Dawson & Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, on condition of the case being placed on the summary docket; and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 7th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harriet C. Brittin,
Appellant,
202 vs.

S. E. Juden, Presiding Justice,
et al., etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for submission under the 32d rule on Monday, October 15th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Illinois Central Railroad Company, Appellant,
248 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Corona Coal Company, Appellant,
42 vs.
The United States.

Upon consideration of the motion to dismiss this appeal,
It is now here ordered by this Court that a rule issue to the appellant to show cause why the appeal should not be dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Corona Coal Company, Appellant,
42 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to dismiss this appeal,
It is now here ordered by this Court that cause be shown by Corona Coal Company, the appellant herein, before this Court, at the City of Washington, why this appeal should not be dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harriet C. Brittin, Appellant,
202 vs.
S. E. Juden, Presiding Justice,
et al., etc.

On consideration of the motion to affirm herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, assigned for submission under the 32d rule on Monday, October 15th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Boettcher et al., Receivers,
etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
270 vs.
The Public Utilities Commission of

the State of Colorado et al.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Title Guaranty & Trust Company and Minnie W. Teets, as Executors of the Last Will and Testament of Joseph W. Teets, deceased, Plaintiffs in Error,

46 vs.

William H. Edwards, Collector of Internal Revenue of the United States for the Second District of New York.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjuged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. O'Neal Sandel, as Administrator of the Personal Estate of Thelma Sandel, deceased, Plaintiff in Error,

154 vs.

The State of South Carolina.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and on motion to affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Aetna Insurance Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
286 vs.
Stokes V. Robertson, State Revenue Agent of the State of Mississippi, etc.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Indian Territory Illuminating Oil Company, Appellant,
386 vs.
Bartlesville Zinc Company et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Luella Swartwood, as Sole Administratrix of the Goods, Chattels and Credits of Harleigh Swartwood, deceased, Plaintiff in Error,
1 vs.
Lehigh Valley Railroad Company.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The American Railway Express Company, Plaintiff in Error,

vs.

The Commonwealth of Kentucky.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The School District of the Borough of Greensburg, Plaintiff in Error,

vs.

S. T. Lopes, Frank W. Hayden, Charles Pringle, et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjuiged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

F. E. Wear, F. W. Casmer, and Irrigation Loan and Trust Company, Plaintiffs in Error,

vs.

Virgil W. Johnston and The Illinois Trust and Savings Bank.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Magnum Electric Company,

Appellant,

23 vs.

Campbell Russell, Art L. Walker, and E. R. Hughes, Individually and as constituting the Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. Bourjois & Company, Inc., 50 vs. George W. Aldridge, Collector of the Port of New York, and Le Benart Import Company, Inc.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the questions certified must be answered in the affirmative upon the authority of Bourjois & Company vs. Katzel, 260 U. S., 689, the defendant not objecting.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Petitioner, 357 vs. Edward H. Childs, Trustee in Bankruptcy of J. Menist Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of

the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

B. Fernandez & Bros., Successors, Petitioner,
365 vs.
Leonor Aylion y Ojeda, etc., et al.

On petitions for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petitions for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petitions be, and the same are hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Agent, etc., Petitioner,
371 vs.
Mrs. Mary Kennedy, Administratrix, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert E. Tod, Commissioner of Immigration, Petitioner,
392 vs.
Szeja Waldman et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
401 vs.

The Formica Insulation Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
415 vs.
James J. Johnston.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Aetna Insurance Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
286 vs.
Stokes V. Robertson, State Revenue Agent of the State of Mississippi, et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, as Agent, etc.,
Petitioner,
347 vs.
Standard Oil Company of Indiana.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Petitioner,
348 vs.
Hettie A. Crouse, Administratrix of the Estate of Elmer H. Crouse, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. Meischbke-Smith, J. C. Van Eck, John Lawson, et al., as Trustees, etc., Petitioners,
356 vs.
Justus S. Wardell, United States Collector of Internal Revenue for the First District of California, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America to the use and benefit of W. B. Young Supply Company, Petitioner,
360 vs.
Charles O. Stewart, George C. Moses, and P. W. Smith.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles H. Addington, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Marvel Oil Burner Company, Inc., Bankrupt, Petitioner,
362 vs.
Forsyth Metal Goods Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sumner Iron Works, Petitioner,
363 vs.
Todd Drydock & Construction Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ray B. Robinson, George A. Robinson, John Aguara, et al., Petitioners,
378 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James Cox Davis, as the Agent designated by the President under and in pursuance of the Transportation Act of 1920, Petitioner,
379 vs.
Marion C. Slocomb, Administratrix of the Estate of Wilson H. Slocomb, Deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Paul P. Glaser, Petitioner,
380 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Julius Conrad, Adolph Silroty, Charles Bisbee, et al.,
Petitioners,
382 vs.
The Mazatlan and the owner thereof, California & Mexico Steamship Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Indian Territory Illuminating Oil Company, Appellant,
386 vs.
Bartlesville Zinc Company and National Zinc Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Me-Gon-Ah-E-Quaince, or Mrs. C. C. Clark, Frank D. Beaulieu, et al., Petitioners,

410 vs.

Otto H. Horn.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Buhl Independent School District No. 3, in Twin Falls County, Idaho, Petitioner,

413 vs.

Neighbors of Woodcraft.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Mills Company, Petitioner,

414 vs.

George F. Hoffman and Peter H. Corr, Copartners doing business under the firm name and style of Hoffman-Corr Manufacturing Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kathryn Sellers, Judge Juvenile Court, District of Columbia, Petitioner,

416 vs.

Willis Brown.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New England Oil Corporation,
Petitioner,
417 vs.
Island Oil Marketing Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Banco Mexicano de Commercio e Industria and Elias S. A. De Lima, Francisco D. P. Cardoza, et al., Appellants,
361 vs.
Deutsche Bank, Thomas W. Miller, Alien Property Custodian, and Frank White, Treasurer of the United States.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the appeal.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Panama Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
369 vs.
Andrew Johnson.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sven Haavik, Appellant,
128 vs.
Alaska Packers' Association.
Alfred Street, suing on behalf of himself, etc., et al., Appellants,

156 vs.
Shipowners' Association of the
Pacific Coast et al.

Clallam County, Washington, et al.,
255 vs.
The United States.

It is ordered by the Court that these cases heretofore assigned for argument on Monday, November 5th next, be, and they are hereby reassigned for argument on Monday, November 12th next, at the head of the call for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
62 vs.
California Midway Oil Company
et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellant, this case was passed per stipulation of counsel.

Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond,
Plaintiff in Error,
553 vs.
D. J. Malloy et al., trading as
Malloy Brothers.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the plaintiff in error.

New York State Railways, Plaintiff
in Error,
103 vs.
N. Monroe Marshall, as Treasurer,
etc., et al.

On motion of Mr. John S. Flannery in behalf of counsel, George K. Shuler, as State Treasurer of the State of New York, and Frances Perkins, as a member of the State Industrial Board of the State of New York, were substituted as parties defendants in error herein.

R. E. Sheehan Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
593 vs.
George K. Shuler, as State Treasurer
of the State of New York, et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John S. Flannery in behalf of counsel.

C. O. Linder, Petitioner,
681 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Turner for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Ridgely for the respondent.

Wenborne-Karpen Dryer Company, Petitioner,
513 vs.
Cutler Dry Kiln Company et al.

On motion of Mr. William R. Rummler for the petitioner, leave was granted counsel for the petitioner to file reply brief within two days.

Peter Weisengoff, Plaintiff in Error,
480 vs.
The State of Maryland.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. H. Ulman for the plaintiff in error.

O. H. Chrisp, Plaintiff in Error,
537 vs.
James C. Davis, Director General, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leslie C. Garnett for the petitioner.

George R. Meek, Petitioner,
590 vs.
Centre County Banking Company et al., etc.;
Florence F. Dale, Petitioner,
591 vs.
Centre County Banking Company et al., etc.; and
Andrew Breeze, Petitioner,
592 vs.
Centre County Banking Company et al., etc.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Mortimer C. Rhone for the petitioners, and by Mr. Newton B. Spangler and Mr. Samuel D. Gittig for the respondents.

E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Company, Petitioner,
517 vs.
James C. Davis, Director General, etc.

On motion of Mr. Charles H. Farrell in behalf of Mr. Luther M. Walter, leave was granted to file brief herein as amicus curiae.

John Brosnan, Jr., et al.,
56 vs.
Margaret E. Brosnan.

The motion for leave to file brief herein as amicus curiae of Mr. Frank J. Hogan was denied.

Louisiana Public Service Commission et al., Appellants,
490 vs.
Shreveport Railways Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John E. Benton in behalf of Mr. Huey P. Long for the appellants.

The State of Missouri ex rel. The St. Louis, Brownsville & Mexico Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
376 vs.
Wilson A. Taylor, Judge, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward J. White, Mr. James F. Green, and Mr. M. W. Hayden for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition.

William S. Brewer, Petitioner,
492 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William S. Brewer, p. p., and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. John W. H. Crim for the respondent.

Asuncion Mitchel, Petitioner,
548 vs.
The Manila Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander Britton, Mr. P. W. Clements, and Mr. L. H. Cake for the petitioner.

Fair Oaks Steamship Corporation, Claimant, etc., Petitioner,
550 vs.
United States Shipping Board et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Griffin for the petitioner and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Chauncey G. Parker, and Mr. Oscar A. Stumpe for the respondents.

Adam Kluchinsky et al., etc., Petitioners,
566 vs.
John Zernosky, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roscoe R. Koch for the petitioner, and by Mr. Daniel C. Donoghue and Mr. M. J. Ryan for the respondents.

Pacific American Fisheries, Petitioners,
577 vs.
Emil Hoof.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Evan S. McCord and Mr. Stephen V. Carey for the petitioner.

Irving Bank-Columbia Trust Company, Petitioner,
584 vs.
New York Railways Company et al.

Thepetition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward Cornell, Mr. Frank D. Pavey, Mr. Martin A. Schenck, and Mr. William J. Hughes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edwin S. S. Sunderland and Mr. Mansfield Ferry for the respondents.

McMillan Contracting Company et al., Appellants,
167 vs.
Walter L. Abernathy et al.

The motion to dismiss this appeal was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. O. H. Dean, Mr. H. M. Langworthy, Mr. Roy B. Thomson, and Mr. M. W. Borders for the appellees in support of the motion, and by Mr. Justin D. Bowersock and Mr. Arthur Miller for the appellants in opposition thereto.

The motion to remand in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Justin D. Bowersock and Mr. Arthur Miller for the appellants in support of the motion, and by Mr. O. H. Dean, Mr. H. M. Langworthy, Mr. Roy B. Thomson, and Mr. M. W. Borders for the appellees in opposition thereto.

McMillan Contracting Company et al., Appellants,
168 vs.
B. Haywood Hagerman.

The motion to dismiss this appeal was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Albert S. Marley for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. Justin D. Bowersock and Mr. Arthur Miller in opposition thereto.

The motion to remand in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Justin D. Bowersock and Mr. Arthur Miller for the appellants in support of the motion, and by Mr. Albert S. Marley for the appellee in opposition thereto.

Jules Schnerb and Joseph Negiment, Petitioners,
433 vs.
Holt Manufacturing Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari in this case has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. N. Love et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
60 vs.
James S. Griffith et al.

This cause was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to section 9 of rule 26.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., Appellants,
63 vs.
The Newtown Gas Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel Homer Woodbridge et al., Executors, etc., Appellants,
51 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. H. P. Doolittle for the appellants, and concluded by Mr. Harry E. Knight for the appellee.

American Railway Express Company, Petitioner,
54 vs.
Lucius P. Levee.

This cause was argued by Mr. Arthur A. Moreno for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles T. Wortham for the respondent.

John Brosnan, Jr., et al.,
56 vs.
Margaret E. Brosnan.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Rudolph H. Yeatman for John Brosnan, Jr., et al., continued by Mr. W. Gwynne Gardiner for Margaret E. Brosnan, and concluded by Mr. Wilton J. Lambert for John Brosnan, Jr., et al. It was ordered that the

whole record be considered; and counsel for Margaret E. Brosnan were granted leave to file an additional brief in one week, and counsel for John Brosnan, Jr., et al., within two days thereafter.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Tuesday, October 9th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

Willis Van Devanter,

James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.

Louis D. Brandeis,

George Sutherland,

Pierce Butler,

Edward T. Sanford.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Guy M. Peters, it is ordered that Julius Moses, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Amasa M. Holcombe, it is ordered that Louis A. Jones, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. O. S. Spillman, it is ordered that Lloyd Dort, Esquire, and John C. Dort, Esquire, of Lincoln, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roy B. Thomson, it is ordered that Peter T. Wheeler, Esquire, of Hazard, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. J. Henning, it is ordered that John E. Ryan, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Superior Water, Light & Power Company, Plaintiff in Error,
57 vs.
City of Superior et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Frank B. Kellogg for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. Louis Hanitch and Mr. S. L. McIntosh for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. Frank B. Kellogg for the plaintiff in error.

Charles E. McGregor, Plaintiff in Error,
58 vs.
George P. Hogan, Sheriff of Warren County, Georgia, et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. L. D. McGregor for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. E.P. Davis for the defendants in error.

C. B. Giles et al., Petitioners,
59 vs.
Henry Vette et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William Burry for the petitioners.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday, October 10th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

Willis Van Devanter,

James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.

Louis D. Brandeis,

George Sutherland,

Pierce Butler,

Edward T. Sanford.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr.Alfred A. Wheat, it is ordered that Leo W. Morrissey, Esquire, of Syracuse, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George L. Wilkinson, it is ordered that Samuel H. Pond, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander T. Vogelsang, it is ordered that Arthur LeRoy Shaw, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. A. Ledbetter, it is ordered that A. Carey Hough, Esquire, of Oklahoma City; John Henry Kane, Esquire, of Bartlesville; and Everett Petry, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Borah, it is ordered that Robert Dwight Leeper, Esquire, of Lewiston, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of

this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

New York State Railways,
Plaintiff in Error,
103 vs.
N. Monroe Marshall, as
Treasurer, etc., et al.

On motion of Mr. John S. Flannery for the plaintiff in error, this case was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to section 9 of rule 26.

C. B. Giles et al.,
Petitioners,
59 vs.
Henry Vette et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. William Burry for the petitioners, by Mr. G. T. Buckingham and Mr. H. K. Tenney for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Guy H. Peters for the petitioners.

Annie Viola Douglas,
Appellant,
61 vs.
J. W. Rhodes.

This cause was argued by Mr. Patrick H. Loughran for the appellant and by Mr. J. A. Tellier for the appellee.

New Orleans Land Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
64 vs.
Robert R. Brott et al.;
and
Robert R. Brott et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
86 vs.
New Orleans Land Company.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Charles Louque for the New Orleans Land Company and continued by Mr. William Winans Wall for Brott et al.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Thursday, October 11th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank H. Sullivan, it is ordered that Henry T. Lindsay, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E. Chamberlain, it is ordered that Charles P. Swindler, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Matthew A. Hall, it is ordered that J. M. Parsons, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Steamship "Gul Djemal", her engines, etc., et al., Appellants,
53 vs.
Campbell & Stuart (Inc.).

On motion of Mr. William A. Purrington for the appellants, this case was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to section 9 of rule 26.

New Orleans Land Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
54 vs.
Robert R. Brott et al.; and

Robert R. Brott et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
86 vs.
New Orleans Land Company.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. William Winans Wall for Brott et al. and concluded by Mr. Charles Louque for New Orleans Land Company.

Paul V. Lacoste et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
65 vs.
Department of Conservation of the State of Louisiana.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Morris B. Redmann for the plaintiffs in error, continued by Mr. Paul A. Sompayrac for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Edwin T. Merrick for the plaintiffs in error.

Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York,
Petitioner,
66 vs.
Hurni Packing Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. James M. Beck for the petitioner and was submitted by Mr. Charles M. Stilwill and Mr. Edwin J. Stason for the respondent.

The United States,
Petitioner,
67 vs.
Frederick L. Merriam;
and
The United States,
Petitioner,
68 vs.
Henry B. Anderson.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner and continued by Mr. Roy C. Gasser for the respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Friday, October 12th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

Willis Van Devanter,

James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.

Louis D. Brandeis,

George Sutherland,

Pierce Butler,

Edward T. Sanford.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Walsh, it is ordered that John A. Cadigan, Esquire, of Superior, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. J. Henning, it is ordered that William H. Wylie, Esquire, of San Diego, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Theodore A. Hostetler, it is ordered that Emerson Stringham, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Bernard S. Barron, it is ordered that Joseph K. Allenbogen, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Southern Power Company, Petitioner,
110 vs.
North Carolina Public Service
Company et al.

On motion of Mr. R. V. Lindabury for the petitioner, this case was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to section 9 of rule 26.

The United States, Petitioner,
67 vs.
Frederick L. Merriam; and
The United States, Petitioner,
68 vs.
Henry B. Anderson.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Roy C. Gasser for the respondents, and was concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner.

Chicago Cold Storage Warehouse Company, Appellant,
69 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Charles T. Tittmann for the appellant, continued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the appellee, and was concluded by Mr. Peter B. Nelson for the appellant.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, etc., Petitioner,
70 vs.
George Wechsler.

This cause was argued by Mr. Roy B. Thomson for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. S. Hogsett for the respondent.

James C. Davis, as Agent, etc., Petitioner,
71 vs.
Lee A. Wolfe.

This cause was argued by Mr. Frank H. Sullivan for the petitioner, and was submitted by Mr. Sidney Thorne Able and Mr. P. H.Cullen for the respondent.

Canute Steamship Company (Limited) et al., Petitioners,
72 vs.
Pittsburgh & West Virginia Coal Company et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Charles R. Hickox for the petitioners.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Monday, October 15th, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander T. Vogelsang, it is ordered that John C. Altman, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, it is ordered that S. D. McReynolds, Esquire, of Chattanooga, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, it is ordered that Luther A. Johnson, Esquire, of Corsicana, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins, it is ordered that H. E. Wassell, Esquire, of Corsicana, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry E. Knight, it is ordered that L. G. Miller, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank H. Reid, it is ordered that Frank J. Jones, Esquire, of Joliet, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to theCourt in this behalf by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage, it is ordered that A. Rea Williams, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counseller of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chester A. Gwinn, it is ordered that Maurice Rey McMicken, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counseller of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Johanna Frese, Administratrix of the Estate of Joseph J. Frese, deceased, Petitioner,
27 vs.
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Thomas D. McCarthy, United States Marshal for the Southern District of New York, Appellant,
404. Oct.Term,1922. vs.
Jules W. Arnstein.

On consideration of the petition for a rehearing in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted; and the cause assigned for reargument on Monday, November 19th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

R. E. Sheehan Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
593 vs.
George K. Shuler, as State Treasurer of the State of New York, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 7th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louisiana Public Service Commission et al., Appellants,
490 vs.
Shreveport Railways Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 7th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond, Plaintiff in Error,
553 vs.
D. J. Malloy and J. H. Malloy, trading as Malloy Brothers.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, on the condition that the cause be placed on the summary docket, and assigned for argument on Monday, January 7th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Peter Weisengoff, Plaintiff in Error,
480 vs.
The State of Maryland.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument with case No. 127, as one case, when No. 127 is reached.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Petitioner,
423 vs.
Freda Groeger, Administratrix of the Estate of John C. Groeger, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. L. May, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of George W. Cowen Company, Inc., Bankrupt, Petitioner,
450 vs.
J. M. Henderson, Jr., and T. J. Seamell.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ziang Sung Wan, Petitioner,
451 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles V. Duffy, Collector of Internal Revenue for the United States for the Fifth District of New Jersey, Petitioner,
455 vs.
The Central Railroad Company of New Jersey.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. L. Lancaster and Charles L. Wallace, Receivers, etc., Petitioners,
395 vs.
R. A. Sexton, Administrator of the Estate of William T. Dunn, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Sixth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Sixth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank F. Pels Company, Inc., Petitioner,
422 vs.
Saxony Spinning Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United Shoe Machinery Corporation, Petitioner,
427 vs.
Lorenz Muther.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ethel V. Lanston, Petitioner,
431 vs.
Aubrey Lanston and American Security and Trust Company, Trustees.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein

to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Continental Insurance Company et al., Petitioners, vs. Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company. 435

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

S. M. Nixon et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 436

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, itis now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

August Pope et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 437

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupen had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jacob Petry, Petitioner, vs. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. 439

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel

thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Merrimack National Bank, Petitioner,
446 vs.
Hollis R. Bailey et al., Trustees, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Clara F. Chapin, Executrix of the Will of George L. Chapin, deceased, Petitioner,
448 vs.
Bartholomew A. Brickley, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Codman, Fletcher & Company, Bankrupts.
Clara F. Chapin, Executrix of the Will of George L. Chapin, deceased, Petitioner.
(In the matter of Codman, Fletcher & Company, Bankrupts).
No. 449.

On petition for writs of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Guillermo Severino, Petitioner,
452 vs.
Fabiola Severino and Felicitas Villanueva.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein

to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby,denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

R. L. Bermett & Sons,
Petitioners,
462 vs.
Farmers Seed & Gin Company
of Paris, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

International Radio Telegraph
Company, Petitioner,
465 vs.
Atlantic Communication Company.

International Radio Telegraph
Company, Petitioner,
466 vs.
Atlantic Communication Company.

Marconi Wireless Telegraph
Company, Petitioner,
502 vs.
Atlantic Communication Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writsof certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Juvenile Shoe Company,
Incorporated, Petitioner,
470 vs.
Federal Trade Commission.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Eva Hand, Administratrix of the Estate of Fay D. Hand, deceased, Petitioner,
474 vs.
James C. Davis, Agent of the President under Section 206 of the Transportation Act of 1920.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Union Central Life Insurance Company, Petitioner,
481 vs.
Isaac M. Roden, Michael Roden, Reuben Roden, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Paper Products Company of Indiana, Petitioner,
483 vs.
Lagerloeff Trading Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry Fischer, Petitioner,
491 vs.
Wabash Railway Company and
Delaware, Lackawanna & Western
Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jack Mays, Petitioner,
496 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mitsubishi Shoji Kaisha,
Limited, Petitioner,
499 vs.
James C. Davis, Director
General of Railroads, as
Agent (operating the
Northern Pacific Railway
Company), etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dampskibs Selsk Dannebrog, Petitioner, vs. J. Aron & Company, Inc., Taylor & Thompson Spice Company, Alex. Von Gotard, et al., etc., et al.

501

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hector H. Elwell, Appellant, vs. The United States of America and John J. Bradley, United States Marshal for the Northern District of Illinois.

55

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Annie Viola Douglas, Appellant, vs. J. W. Rhodes.

61

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago Cold Storage Warehouse
Company, Appellant,
69 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.
The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced that the Court will take a recess from Monday, the 22nd instant, to Monday, November 12th next.

The United States of America, In Error to the United States Circuit Court
Plaintiff in Error, of Appeals for the Second Circuit.
88 vs.
The National City Bank of New
York.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas M. Brady, Appellant,
121 vs.
Albert B. Fall, Secretary
of the Interior, etc.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee, Hubert Work, present Secretary of the Interior, was substituted as the party appellee herein.

First National Bank in St.
Louis, Plaintiff in Error,
252 vs.
The State of Missouri at the
information of Jesse W. Barrett,
Attorney General.

The motion for leave to file brief as amicus curiae and to take part in the oral argument herein, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for The United States; and suggestions on behalf of the defendant in error were submitted by Mr. Robert C. Morris, Mr. Harold H. Small, and Mr. Jesse W. Barrett.

First National Bank in St. Louis,
Plaintiff in Error,
252 vs.
The State of Missouri at the information of Jesse W. Barrett, Attorney General.

The motion to extend the scope of the reargument herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Otto A. Schlobohm in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Robert C. Morris in behalf of Mr. Jesse W. Barrett for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

The Banco Mexicano de Commercio e Industria et al., Appellants,
361 vs.
Deutsche Bank et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf.

A. W. Duckett & Company (Inc.),
Appellant,
409 vs.
The United States.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee.

Justus S. Wardell, as Collector of Internal Revenue for the First District of California, Petitioner,
705. Oct.Term,1921. vs.
James A. Blum et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner, the time within which to file suggestions herein was extended until the 22nd instant.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
559 vs.
Ninety-five Barrels, more or less, alleged Apple Cider Vinegar, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner, and by Mr. John G. White and Mr. Austin V. Cannon for the respondents.

Ephraim Lederer, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., Petitioner,
582 vs.
Fidelity Trust Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. Gordon McCouch for the respondent.

Washington-Southern Navigation Company 108 vs. Baltimore & Philadelphia Steamboat Company.	On motion of Mr. Otto Schlobohm in that behalf, this case was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.
Ex parte In the Matter of the Transportes Maritimos do Estado, A Department of the Government of the Republic of Portugal, Petitioner. ---, Orig'l.	The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus and/or prohibition was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. Dudley Kohler for the petitioner.
Waldeman Gmerich & Jeremiah T. Regan, copartners, etc., Appellant, 79 vs. S. F. Rutter, as Prohibition Director, etc.	On motion of counsel in that behalf, this case was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.
Porto Rico Fertilizer Company, Petitioner, 563 vs. Pedro Candia.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis G. Caffey for the petitioner, and by Mr. Jose A. Poventud for the respondent.
A. J. Oliver, as Trustee, etc., et al., Petitioners, 574 vs. The United States of America.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis V. Crowley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.
George L. Meaker et al., Trustees, etc., Appellants, 208 vs. Ohio River Sand Company et al.	The motion to dismiss this appeal was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Bryce Baskin for the appellees, and by Mr. Helm Bruce for the appellants.
Harriet C. Brittin, Appellant, 202 vs. S. B. Judson, Presiding Justice, et al.	This case was submitted pursuant to the 32nd rule, by Mr. Patrick H. Cullen and Mr. T. T. Fauntleroy for the appellant, and by Mr.

Arthur L. Oliver for the respondents.

Matt Walser, Plaintiff in Error,
80 vs.
City of Sioux Falls.
Porter for the defendant in error.

This case was submitted by Mr. Joe Kirby for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. R. W. Parliman and Mr. W. G.

Edwin Schwab, Plaintiff in Error,
81 vs.
Friend W. Richardson, as Treasurer, etc.

This case was submitted by Mr. W. I. Brobeck and Mr. Herbert W. Clark for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. U. S. Webb for the defendant in error.

Canute Steamship Company, Limited, et al., Petitioners,
72 vs.
Pittsburgh & West Virginia Coal Company et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Charles R. Hickox for the petitioners, by Mr. Thomas F. Barrett and Mr. Theodore Kiendl for the respondents, and was concluded by Mr. Charles R. Hickox for the petitioners.

Richard M. Jones, Plaintiff in Error,
73 vs.
Union Guano Company (Inc.).

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. E. C. Jerome for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. Louis M. Swink and Mr. W. M. Hendren for the defendant in error, and was concluded by Mr. E. C. Jerome for the plaintiff in error.

The Salem Trust Company, Petitioner,
74 vs.
Manufacturers' Finance Company et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Alexander Whiteside for the petitioner, continued by Mr. Robert G. Dodge for the respondents, and was concluded by Mr. Alexander Whiteside for the petitioner.

Theodore A. Heyer, doing business as T. A. Heyer Duplicator Company, Petitioner,
75 vs.
Duplicator Manufacturing Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Samuel W. Banning for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford. Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Esquire, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William S. Bennet,, It is ordered that Abraham M. Wattenberg, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William S. Bennett, It is ordered that Edward W. McGrew, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Piel Brothers, Appellant,
95. vs.
Ralph A. Day, Federal Prohibition Director etc.

This case was passed, to be heard with case No. 200, when No. 200 is reached.

Southeastern Express Company, Appellant,
96. vs.
Stokes V. Robertson, State Revenue Agent etc., et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Mississippi.

Southeastern Express Company, Appellant,
96. vs.
Stokes V. Robertson, State Revenue Agent etc., et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Mississippi.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. S. R. Prince, of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal.

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this Appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs, without prejudice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John D. Flanagan, Petitioner,
346. vs.
Federal Coal Company.

The time prescribed by the rule in which the petition should have been submitted was waived; and the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James J. Lynch for the petitioner.

Ne-Kah-Wah-She-Tun-Kah et al., Appellants,
520. vs.
Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, et al.

The motion to advance herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. F. H. Ogilby for the appellants.

Theodore A. Heyer, doing business as T. A. Heyer Duplicator Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
75. vs.
Duplicator Manufacturing Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Samuel W. Banning for the petitioner, by Mr. G. L. Wilkinson for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Samuel W. Banning for the petitioner.

Charles G. Binderup, Plaintiff in Error,
77. vs.
Pathe Exchange, Inc., et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Dana B. Van Dusen for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. William Marston Seabury and Mr. Arthur F. Mullen for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. Dana Van Dusen for the plaintiff in error.

Louis Klebe et al., Copartners etc., Appellants,
78. vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Daniel C. Donoghue for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Esquire, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Nelson T. Hartson, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, and Joseph E. Davies, Esquire, of Madison, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. T. Boys, It is ordered that George E. Merritt, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John A. Kratz, It was ordered that William O. Goddard, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Louis Klebe et al., Copartners etc., Appellants,
78. vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Daniel C. Donoghue for the appellants, and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Ottinger

Charles L. Craig, Petitioner,

82. vs.

William C. Hecht, United States Marshal etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. E. L. Mooney for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the respondent.

The Matthew Addy Company,
Petitioner,

84. vs.

The United States.

Benjamin H. Ford, Petitioner,

85. vs.

The United States.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. ~~George Ross Hull for the respondent.~~ Julius R. Samuels for the petitioners, and continued by Mr. George Ross Hull for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert H. Lovett, It is ordered that Joseph C. Bruce, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert H. Lovett, It is ordered that Harold F. Jones, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mabel W. Willebrandt, It is ordered that Sidney J. Parsons, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Park Trammell, It is ordered that W. K. Zewadski, Jr., Esquire, of Tampa, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry F. Ashurst, It is ordered that George A. Morin, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
102. vs.
Raymond Bros.-Clark Company.
Rule 26.

On motion of Mr. George Ross Hull in that behalf, It is ordered that this case be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9,

The Matthew Addy Company,
Petitioner,
84. vs.
The United States.
Benjamin N. Ford,
Petitioner,
85. vs.
The United States.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. George Ross Hull for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Julius R. Samuels for the petitioners.

The United States, Appellant,
87. vs.
William W. Slaymaker.
for the appellee.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Lovett for the appellant, and by Mr. George A. King

Samuel A. Myers, Copartners etc., Petitioners,
89. vs.
International Trust Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Edward F. McClennen for the petitioners, and by Mr. John R. Lazenby for the respondent.

Edward Hines Yellow Pine Trustees et al., Appellants,
91. vs.
The United States et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William S. Bennett for the appellants, continued by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for The United States, and by Mr. P. J. Farrell for The Interstate Commerce Commission.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louid D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Park Trammell, It is ordered that G. B. Wells, Esquire, of Plant City, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel Herrick, It is ordered that William F. Rose, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert G. Simmons, It is ordered that N. Dwight Ford, Esquire, of Broken Bow, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. H. Rumble, It is ordered that R. B. Watts, Esquire, of Birmingham, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Edward Hines Yellow Pine Trustees et al., Appellants,

91. vs.

The United States et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Joseph E. Davies for the appellee American Wholesale Lumber Association, by special leave of Court, and concluded by Mr. William S. Bennett for the appellants.

De Witt Garrison Brown et al., Plaintiffs in Error,

97. vs.

The United States.

The United States, Plaintiff in Error,

98. vs.

De Witt Garrison Brown et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. J. H. Peterson for De Witt Garrison Brown et al., and by Mr. W. W. Dyar for The United States.

The United States ex rel. Michael Bilokumsky, Appellant,

92. vs.

Robert E. Tod, Commissioner of Immigration etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. Walter Nelles for the appellant, and by Mr. George Ross Hull for the appellee.

Jay Burns Baking Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,

94. vs.

Charles W. Bryan, as Governor etc.,

This cause was argued by Mr. M. A. Hall for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. Lloyd Dort for the defendant in error.

The Court is adjourned until Monday

MONDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
~~James C. McReynolds~~,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Benjamin B. Pettus, It is ordered that Paul L. Martin, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Guy Mason, It is ordered that Joseph Charles Meyerstein, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert H. Lovett, It is ordered that Dwight E. Rorer, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lunsford L. Hamner, It is ordered that Hugh A. Allen, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Herman L. Ehern, It is ordered that H. P. Janisch, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert H. Lovett, It is ordered that Joseph T. Keating, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel V. Proudfit, It is ordered that Herbert L. Brooke, Esquire, of Helena, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. Granville Munson, It is ordered that H. Lewis Brown, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
20. vs.
Leroy W. Walter.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

American Railway Express Company,
Petitioner,
54. vs.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeal, First Circuit, of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeal, First Circuit, of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeal in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeal for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads etc., Petitioner,
70. vs.
George Wechsler.

On writ of certiorari to the Kansas City Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Kansas City Court of Appeals for the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Kansas City Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Kansas City Court of Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr.Justice Holmes.

John H. Brede, Appellant,
45. vs.
James M. Powers, United States Marshal for the Eastern District of New York.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Mr.Justice McReynolds and Mr. Justice Brandeis concur in the result.

Joe Wyman, Plaintiff in Error,
140. vs.
The United States of America.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Mr. Justice McReynolds and Mr. Justice Brandeis concur in the result.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

First National Bank in St. Louis,
Plaintiff in Error,
252. vs.
The State of Missouri at the information of Jesse W. Barrett, Attorney General.

On consideration of the motion of The United States for leave to file a brief herein as amicus curiae, and to participate in the oral argument of this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

First National Bank in St. Louis,
Plaintiff in Error,
252. vs.
The State of Missouri at the information of Jesse W. Barrett, Attorney General.

On consideration of the motion of the plaintiff in error for modification of order, and to extend the scope of the reargument in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and that any further briefs on behalf of the plaintiff in error or of The United States shall be filed on or before November 1st, and briefs in reply thereto shall be filed on or before November 9th, next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of Transportes Maritimos, etc.,
26 Original. Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus and/or prohibition herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of The Republic of Portugal, Owner of the Steamship "Sao Vicente", by his Excellency Jose d'Alte, Minister Plenipotentiary and Envoy Extraordinary to the United States of America,
26, Original. Petitioner.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of mandamus and/or prohibition herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that cause be shown by the Honorable Francis A. Winslow and the Honorable William J. Bondy, Judges of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and the other Judges and Officers thereof, before this Court, at the City of Washington, on Monday, January 7th next, or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, why the prayer of said petition should not be granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George L. Meeker et al., Trustees etc., Appellants,
208. vs.
Ohio River Sand Company et al.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Banco Mexicano de Commercio e Industria et al., Appellants,
361. vs.
Deutsche Bank et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 7th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America et al., Appellants,
469. vs.
The New York Central Railroad Company et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 7th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. M. Duckett & Company, Inc., Appellant,
409. vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ne-Kah-Wah-She-Tun-Kah et al., Appellants,
520. vs.
Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, et al.,

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry Glassman, Petitioner,
373. vs.
Robert C. Rand, Receiver etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edmund L. Ebert et al., Petitioners,
512. vs.
Harry P. Poston.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to

the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. I. DuPont de Nemours & Company,
Petitioner,
517. vs.
James C. Davis, Director General etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William R. Rodman, U. S. Marshal,
Petitioner,
546. vs.
Roland R. Pothier.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
547. vs.
Roy Stroud.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Springfield Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Springfield Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, as Owner of the Steamship "Llama",
Petitioner,
549. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
559. vs.
Ninety-five Barrels, more or less, alleged Apple Cider Vinegar, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

October 22, 1923.

Fullerton-Krueger Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
573. vs.
Northern Pacific Railway Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. J. Oliver, as Trustee etc.,
Petitioner,
574. vs.
The United States of America et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of

the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. O. Linder, Petitioner,
581. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ephraim Lederer, Collector of Internal Revenue etc., Petitioner,
582. vs.
Fidelity Trust Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George R. Meek, Petitioner,
590. vs.
Centre County Banking Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Florence F. Dale, Petitioner,
591. vs.
Centre County Banking Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and

of the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Andrew Breeze, Petitioner, vs. Centre County Banking Company et al. 592. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fox Typewriter Company, Petitioner, vs. Underwood Typewriter Company. 418. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William S. Brewer, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 492. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Walter L. Ross, Receiver, Toledo, St. Louis & Western Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Industrial Commission of Illinois et al. 505. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Circuit Court of St. Clair County, State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein

to the Circuit Court of St. Clair County, State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. B. Simpson, Petitioner,
506. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sue Phillips Gates, Petitioner,
510. vs.
Maryland Casualty Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certicrari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wenbourne-Karpen Dryer Company,
Petitioner,
513. vs.
Cutler Dry Kiln Company et al.

On petition for writ of certicrari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certicrari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Territory of Alaska, Petitioner, vs. Annette Island Packing Company et al. 514. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry L. Bogart et al., Petitioners, vs. Southern Pacific Company. 515. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the SecondCircuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry L. Bogart et al., Petitioners, vs. Southern Pacific Company. 516. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph F. Dierickx, Petitioner, vs. James C. Davis, Federal Agent etc. 523. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana,and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be,

and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Commercial Electrical Supply Company, Petitioner,
525. vs.
W. L. Curtis, Receiver of the Commonwealth Public Service Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Nicodemus B. Hurr et al., Petitioners,
527. vs.
Everett W. Davis et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Chain Company, Petitioner,
535. vs.
Interstate Iron & Steel Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mount Vernon Car Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
536. vs.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

O. H. Chrisp, Plaintiff in Error, vs. James C. Davis, Director General. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

537.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Joring et al., Petitioners, vs. William Leslie Harriss et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

538.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Marie Dove Williamson, Petitioner, vs. Seaboard Air Line Railway Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

541.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank Trueba, Petitioner,
545. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Asuncion Mitchel, Petitioner,
548. vs.
The Manila Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fair Oaks Steamship Corporation, Claimant of Steamship "West Irmo", Petitioner,
550. vs.
United States Shipping Board et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sanford Coal Company, Petitioner,
557. vs.
Wisconsin Bridge & Iron Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and

of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Porto Rico Fertilizer Company, Petitioner, vs. Pedro Gandia. 563. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sebastian Bridge District, Petitioner, vs. Missouri Pacific Railroad Company. 564. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Adam Kluchinsky et al., etc., Petitioners, vs. John Zernosky, etc., et al. 566. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Algional H. Rae, Claimant of 1,250 Cases of Intoxicating Liquors,
Petitioner,
567. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Eugene Albury, Claimant of the Schooner "Henry L. Marshall",
Petitioner,
568. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Eugene Albury, Claimant of the Schooner "Henry L.Marshall",
Petitioner,
569. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pacific American Fisheries,
Petitioner,
577. vs.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Company, Petitioner,
578. vs.
Spencer, Kellogg & Sons, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward A. Rumely et al., Petitioners,
579. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Irving Bank-Columbia Trust Company, Petitioner,
584. vs.
New York Railways Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be,

The United States of America ex rel. St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,

398. vs.

Interstate Commerce Commission et al.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edgar S. Appleby and John S. Appleby, etc., Executors etc., of Charles E. Appleby, deceased, Plaintiffs in Error,

532. vs.

The City of New York et al.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edgar S. Appleby and John S. Appleby, Plaintiffs in Error,

533. vs.

John T. Delaney, as Commissioner of Docks of the City of New York.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harriet C. Brittin, Appellant,

202. vs.

S. E. Julen, Presiding Justice, T. R. Cole and E. W. Shade, Associate Justices of the County Court of Pemiscot County, Missouri, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Matt Walser, Plaintiff in Error,

80. vs.

City of Sioux Falls.

In Error to the Municipal Court of the City of Sioux Falls, State of South Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Municipal Court of the City of Sioux Falls, State of South Dakota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Homer I. Stephenson, Petitioner,

614. vs.

Frank Kratke, Warden of the Common Jail of the City and County of Denver, Colorado.

Mr. Blackburn Esterline, of counsel for the appellee, having filed in open Court the following certificate, to wit:

"United States of America,)
District of Colorado.....) ss.

In the District Court of the United States
for the District of Colorado,
Sitting at Denver.

I, CHARLES W. BISHOP, Clerk of the District Court of the United States for the District of Colorado, do hereby certify that in a certain cause pending in said Court, wherein Homer I. Stephenson was petitioner, and Frank Kratke, as Warden of the Common Jail of the City and County of Denver, State of Colorado, was respondent, on to wit: the twenty-sixth day of January, A. D. 1923, an order dismissing the petition for habeas corpus and remanding the petitioner to the custody of the respondent was made. From which order the petitioner prayed and was allowed an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States. Upon which appeal a citation was issued on the nineteenth day of February, A. D. 1923, returnable in thirty days. And afterwards and on to-wit: the sixteenth day of March, A. D. 1923, the return day of said citation was enlarged and extended for forty days. And afterwards and on to-wit: the thirteenth day of April, A. D. 1923, the return day of said citation was further enlarged and extended for forty days.

IN TESTIMONY to the above and foregoing, I do hereunto subscribe my name and affix the seal of said District Court, at Denver in said District, this seventeenth day of October, A. D. 1923.

(SEAL). (Signed) CHARLES W. BISHOP, Clerk."

and moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the ninth rule,

And it appearing to the Court that the appellant has failed to have his cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court,

It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, docketed and dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William H. Edwards, former Collector etc.,
Petitioner
276. vs.
Joseph Jermain Slocum et al.

The motion to advance was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the petitioner.

Justus S. Wardell, Collector of Internal Revenue for the First District of California,
Petitioner
705, Oct. Term, 1921. vs.
James A. Blum and Anglo-California Trust Company, as Executors etc.

On consideration of the motion of counsel for the petitioner for leave to withdraw motion to revoke order denying the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

First National Bank in St. Louis,
Plaintiff in Error,
252. vs.
The State of Missouri at the information of Jesse W. Barrett, Attorney General.

On motion of Mr. Herman L. Ekern in that behalf, leave was granted to file briefs herein as amici curiae in behalf of the Attorneys General of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Illinois, Indiana, and Iowa; and motion for leave to take part in the oral argument was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Herman L. Ekern in that behalf.

Dayton-Goose Creek Railway Company,
Appellant,
550. vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. A. Rea Williams in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of Samuel W. Moore herein as amicus curiae.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
314. vs.
Roger B. Wood, Trustee in Bankruptcy etc.

The motion to dismiss or affirm herein or transfer this cause to the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Godfrey Goldmark for the appellee in support of the motion; with leave to counsel for the appellant to file opposition thereto within one week.

Louisiana Public Service Commission et al., Appellants,
421. vs.
Morgan's Louisiana & Texas Railroad & Steamship Company.

The motion to advance was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. E. Benton in that behalf.

Harry Kellman, Plaintiff in Error,
157. vs.
City of St. Louis.

The motion to dismiss herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Franklin D. Jones in behalf of Mr. George D. Haid for the defendant in error in support of the motion.

Southern Power Company, Petitioner,
110. vs.
North Carolina Public Service Company et al.

The motion to maintain the status quo pending the determination of the suit in this Court was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. P. Bynum, Mr. R. V. Lindabury, Mr. E. T. Cansler, and Mr. W. S. O'B. Robinson, Jr., for the petitioner in support of the motion, and by Mr. Aubrey L. Brooks and Mr. John W. Davis for the respondent in opposition thereto.

Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, Petitioner,
607. vs.
Southern Pacific Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. H. McGrann and Mr. John M. Woolsey for the petitioner, and by Mr. D. Roger Englar, Mr. T. Catesby Jones and Mr. Charles C. Burlingham for the respondents.

Isom Grayson et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
586. vs.
James A. Harris et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert M. Rainey and Mr. Streeter B. Flynn for the plaintiffs in error in support of the petition, and by Mr. Robert F. Blair and Mr. George S. Ramsey for the defendants in error in opposition thereto.

Austin Nichols & Company, Petitioner,
609. vs.
Steamship "Isla De Panay", Her Engines etc., et al.

Eug. Sanchez et al., etc., Petitioners,
610. vs.
Steamship "Isla De Panay", Her Engines etc.

E. Tolibia & Company, Petitioner,
611. vs.
Steamship "Isla De Panay", Her Engines etc.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. Catesby Jones and Mr. James W. Ryan for the petitioner, and by Mr. John W. Crandall for the respondents.

Matthew Lowe, Plaintiff in Error,
615. vs.
Benjamin E. Dyson, U. S. Marshal etc.

William P. McCarthy,
Plaintiff in Error,
616. vs.
Benjamin E. Dyson, U. S. Marshal etc.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the Clerk is directed to docket these cases as of this date without payment of costs, pursuant to the provisions of 42 Statutes at Large, Chapter 246, page 666.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday,

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. King, It is ordered that George P. Parker, Esquire, of Provo, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Carey, It is ordered that Thomas F. Trumbull, Esquire, of Port Angeles, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Carey, It is ordered that John D. Fletcher, Esquire, of Tacoma, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John H. Brickenstein, It is ordered that Edward W. Vaill, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham, It is ordered that R. Granville Curry, Esquire, of Staunton, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Sewall Key, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Charles K. Friedman, Esquire, of Toledo, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh Taylor Gordon, Jr., It is ordered that William W. Clary, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. King, It is ordered that J. Robert Robinson, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham, It is ordered that Sophus Dee Hanson, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Luther A. Johnson, It is ordered that Joseph E. Woods, Esquire, of Teague, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham, It is ordered that John H. Howell, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl H. Richmond, It is ordered that E. H. Callaway, Esquire, of Augusta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George T. Buckingham, It is ordered that R. B. Webster, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. T. Boys, It is ordered that John Frank Martin, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Blood Smith, It is now here ordered that J. M. Tincher, Esquire, of Medicine Lodge, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. Ross Perry, Jr., It is ordered that Glenn C. Mead, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh C. Smith, It is ordered that Platt Hubbell, Esquire, of Trenton, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Charles E. McGregor,

Plaintiff in Error,

58. vs.

George P. Hogan, Sheriff of Warren County, Georgia, et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

James C. Davis, Designated Agent under the Transportation Act,

Petitioner,

71. vs.

Lee A. Wolfe.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the Courts of the State of Missouri.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Canute Steamship Company, Limited, and Compania Naviera Sota y Aznar,

Petitioners,

72. vs.

Pittsburgh and West Virginia Coal Company et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with

costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

August V. Anderson, Warden United States Penitentiary, Leavenworth, Kansas,
Petitioner,
vs.
Arthur Corall.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

44.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas with directions that the respondent, Arthur Corall, be restored to the custody of the Warden of the United States Penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kansas.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Frank Terrace and Elizabeth Terrace, his wife, and N. Nakatsuka,
Appellants,
vs.
Lindsay L. Thompson, Attorney General of the State of Washington.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

29.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Mr. Justice McReynolds and Mr. Justice Brandeis think there is no justiciable question involved, and that the case should have been dismissed on that ground.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

W. I. Porterfield and Y. Mizuno,

Appellants,

28. vs.

U. S. Webb, as Attorney General of the State of California, and Thomas Lee Woolwine, as District Attorney of Los Angeles.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Mr. Justice McReynolds and Mr. Justice Brandeis think there is no justiciable question involved, and that the case should be dismissed on that ground. Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Charles Butters, Edith F. Wright, Rockbridge Place Company, et al.,

Plaintiffs in Error,

16. vs.

City of Oakland, Perry F. Brown, as Superintendent of Streets, F. A. Cooley, as Treasurer etc., et al.

In Error to the District Court of Appeal of the State of California in and for the First Appellate District.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of Appeal of the State of California in and for the First Appellate District, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court of Appeal in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

November 12, 1923.

Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York, Petitioner,

66. vs.

Hurni Packing Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record

from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the Courts of the State of Iowa; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Iowa.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
67. vs.
Frederick L. Merriam.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
68. vs.
Henry B. Anderson.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Louis Klebe et al., Copartners etc.,
Appellants,
vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

78.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

James A. Baker, Receiver of the International & Great Northern Railway Company, et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Karl L. Druesedow, Tax Collector of Harris County, Texas, et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas.

12.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

James A. Baker, Receiver of the International & Great Northern Railway Company, et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Karl L. Druesedow, Tax Collector of Harris County, Texas, et al.

12.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

James A. Baker, Receiver of the International & Great Northern Railway Company, et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Karl L. Druesedow, Tax Collector of Harris County, Texas, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas.

12.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by

this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the Courts of the State of Texas.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Edward Hines Yellow Pine Trustees, Edward Hines, C. P. Wiehe, and L. L. Barther, Trustees, Appellants,

91. vs.

The United States of America, The Interstate Commerce Commission, and American Wholesale Lumber Association.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The United States of America ex rel. Michael Bilokumsky, Appellant,

92. vs.

Robert E. Tod, Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of New York, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

James Cox Davis, as the Agent of the President, etc., Plaintiff in Error,

530. vs.

Marion C. Slocomb, as Administratrix of the Estate of Wilson M. Slocomb, deceased.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

St. Johns, N. F., Shipping Corporation, Owner etc.,
Petitioner,
43. vs.
S. A. Companhia Geral Commercial do Rio de Janeiro.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the Courts of the State of New York; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Superior Water, Light & Power Company, Plaintiff in Error,
57. vs.
City of Superior and F. A. Baxter, as Mayor, et al., etc.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Des Moines National Bank,

Plaintiff in Error,

vs.

Thomas Fairweather, Mayor; John Budd, E. A. Elliott, et al., Councilmen of the City of Des Moines, etc., et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

17.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

New Orleans Land Company,

Plaintiff in Error,

vs.

Robert R. Brott, Martha J. Brott, and George O. Brott.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

64.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Robert R. Brott, Martha J. Brott, and George O. Brott,

Plaintiffs in Error,

vs.

New Orleans Land Company.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

86.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Theodore A. Heyer, doing business as T. A. Heyer Duplicator Company.

Petitioner,

75. vs.

Duplicator Manufacturing Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause come on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Edwin Schwab, Plaintiff in Error,

81. vs.

Friend W. Richardson, as Treasurer of the State of California.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The United States, Appellant,

87. vs.

William W. Slaymaker.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Director General of Railroads,

Petitioner,

39. vs.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the Courts of the State of New York.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edwin Denby, Secretary of the Navy of the United States of America,

Plaintiff in Error,

47. vs.

George A. Berry.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia with direction to overrule the demurrer to the amended answer, and for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harvey McConaughey, for himself and others, employees of the Panama Canal and of the Panama Railroad Company,

Appellants,

48. vs.

J. J. Morrow, Governor of the Panama Canal; H. A. A. Smith, Auditor of the Panama Canal, and R. W. Glaw, Paymaster of the Panama Canal.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with

costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Canal Zone.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel Homer Woodbridge and Edward Woodbridge Barnes, Executors of William E. Woodbridge, deceased,

Appellants,

51. vs.

The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel A. Myers and Harry Myers, Copartners as S. A. & H. Myers,

Petitioners,

89. vs.

International Trust Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Superior Court, County of Suffolk, Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court, County of Suffolk, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here criered and adjuiged by this Court that the judgment of the said Superior Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Superior Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

De Witt Garrison Brown and Roosa C. Brown, Plaintiffs in Error,

97. vs.

The United States of America.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,

98. vs.

De Witt Garrison Brown and Roosa C. Brown.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Idaho.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record

from the District Court of the United States for the District of Idaho, on writ of error and cross-writ of error, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

It is further ordered and adjudged by this Court that the cross-writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

First National Bank in St. Louis,
Plaintiff in Error,
252. vs.
The State of Missouri at the information of Jesse W. Barrett, Attorney General.

On consideration of the motions for leave to participate in the oral argument as amici curiae herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, severally denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Power Company, Petitioner,
110. vs.
North Carolina Public Service Company et al.

On consideration of the motion to maintain the status quo pending suit,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied without prejudice; and further consideration of the motion postponed to the hearing of the cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Aetna Insurance Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
286. vs.
Stokes V. Robertson, State Revenue Agent of the State of Mississippi.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the petition for a rehearing in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William H. Edwards, former Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York,

Petitioner,

276. vs.

Joseph Jermain Slocum et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 7th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louisiana Public Service Commission et al.,

Appellants,

421 vs.

Morgan's Louisiana & Texas Railroad & Steamship Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 7th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry Kellman, Plaintiff in Error,

157. vs.

The City of St. Louis.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Missouri ex rel. The St. Louis, Brownsville & Mexico Railway Company,

Plaintiff in Error,

376. vs.

Wilson A. Taylor, Judge etc.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Isom Grayson et al.,

Plaintiffs in Error,

586. vs.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by this

Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Standard Oil Company of New Jersey,
Petitioner,
607. vs.
Southern Pacific Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Austin Nichols & Company, Petitioner,
609. vs.
Steamship "Isla De Panay", her Engines etc., et al.

Eug. Sanchez et al., trading as E. Sanchez & Company, Petitioners,
610. vs.
Steamship "Isla De Panay", her Engines etc., et al.

E. Tolibia & Company, Petitioner,
611. vs.
Steamship "Isla De Panay", her Engines etc., et al.

On petition for writs of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Helen C. Frick, Plaintiff in Error,
442. vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Helen C. Frick, Plaintiff in Error,
443. vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Adelaide H. C. Frick et al., etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
444. vs.

Adelaide H. C. Frick et al., etc., Plaintiffs in Error,
445. vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for writs of certiorari

in these cases be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cases on the writs of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Bestwall Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
438. vs.
United States Gypsum Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cowckochee, Plaintiff in Error,
554. vs.
James A. Chapman et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

O R D E R.

It is ordered by this Court that Section 7 of Rule 24 of this Court be amended by striking therefrom the words "fifteen cents per folio", in the clause prescribing fees for preparing records, etc., and substituting the words "ten cents per folio", so that the entire clause will read:

"For preparing the record or a transcript thereof for the printer, indexing the same, supervising the printing, and distributing the printed copies to the Justices, the Reporter, the Law Library, and the parties or their counsel, ten cents per folio; but when the necessary printed copies of the record, as printed for the use of the lower Court, shall be furnished, the fee for supervising shall be five cents per folio."

This order shall apply to causes filed here on or after December 1st, 1923, but not to causes filed prior to that date.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

O R D E R.

It is ordered by this Court that the following be added as Section 5 to Rule 37 of this Court:

5. Whenever application for a writ of certiorari to review a decision of any Court, as provided by this Rule, is granted, the Clerk shall enter an order to that effect. The order shall also direct that the certified transcript of record on file here be deemed and treated as though sent up in reply to a formal writ, and that notice be given to the Court or Judges below and to counsel of record. No formal writ shall issue unless specially directed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

O R D E R.

It is now here ordered by this Court that for the convenience of counsel and litigants the cases coming to this Court from the Ninth Circuit from No. 114 to No. 375, inclusive, be, and they are hereby, assigned for hearing beginning Monday, February 18th, next in advance of other cases on the regular docket.

It is further ordered that the Clerk is directed to notify counsel in the above specified cases of this order.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ziang Sung Wan, Petitioner,
451. vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the respondent.

The State of New Jersey, Complainant,
No. __, Original. vs.
Harry M. Daugherty, Personally and Individually and as Attorney General of the United States, et al.

The motion for leave to file bill of complaint herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Newcorn and Mr. Thomas F. McCran for the complainant.

Charles S. Bohler, Tax Collector of Richmond County, Georgia, et al., Appellants,
551. vs.
E. H. Callaway, as Executor etc.
E. H. Callaway, as Executor etc., Appellant,
552. vs.

The motion to dismiss or affirm on the cross appeal and to reverse on the main appeal; or to advance under Rule 26, was submitted to the con-

Benjamin E. Pierce for the appellants and the cross appellees in support of the motion, and by Mr. E. H. Callaway and Mr. W. M. Howard for the appellee and cross appellant in opposition thereto.

The United States of America ex rel. St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
398. vs.
Interatate Commerce Commission et al.

The motion to advance was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. D. Drayton in that behalf.

Dayton-Goose Creek Railway Company, Appellant,
330. vs.
The United States of Aserica et al.

On motion of counsel in that behalf, leave was granted to file briefs herein as amici curiae.

The State of Ohio ex rel. George S. Hawke, Plaintiff in Error,
545. vs.
Robert A. LeBlond, as Presiding Judge etc.

The motion to advance was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George S. Hawke, pro se.

Railroad Commission of the State of California, Petitioner,
283. vs.
Southern Pacific Company et al.

On motion of Mr. J. E. Benton in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief herein as amicus curiae.

Crew Levick Company, Plaintiff in Error,
518. vs.
The City of Philadelphia to the use of J. Joseph McHugh.

The motion to advance was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Glenn C. Mead in that behalf.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,
644. vs.
Prince Line, Limited.

Mr. William O. Goddard, in behalf of Mr. Cletus Keating for the defendant in error, having filed in open Court the following certificate, to wit:

"United States District Court,
Eastern District of New York.

Prince Line, Ltd.,)
)
vs.) L 1082.
)
United States of America.)

United States of America,) SS:
Eastern District of New York)

I, Percy G. B. Gilkes, Clerk of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York, do hereby certify that on July 31, 1923, there was filed in the above entitled cause by the United States of America the following papers: Petition, and Assignment of Errors; and on the same date a Writ of Error was allowed and issued. That up to the present time no return has been certified on behalf of the United States to said Writ of Error.

In Witness Whereof I have hereunto set my hand and the Seal of the above Court this 18th day of October, 1923.

(SEAL). (Signed) PERCY G. B. Gilkes, Clerk.
By (Signed) J. G. Cochran, Deputy Clerk."

and moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the ninth rule,

And it appearing to the Court that the plaintiff in error has failed to have its cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court,

It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, docketed and dismissed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,

Plaintiff in Error,

645. vs.

American Hawaiian Steamship Company.

Mr. William O. Goddard, in behalf of Mr. Cletus Keating for the defendant in error, having filed in open Court the following certificate, to wit:

"United States District Court,
Eastern District of New York.

American Hawaiian S. S. Co.)
)
vs.) L 1080.
)
United States of America...)

United States of America,)
Eastern District of New York) SS:

I, Percy G. B. Gilkes, Clerk of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York, do hereby certify that on July 31, 1923, there was filed in the above entitled case by the United States of America the following papers: Petition, and Assignment of Errors; and on the same date a Writ of Error was allowed and issued. That up to the present time no return has been certified on behalf of the United States to said writ of error.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and the seal of the above Court this 18th day of October, 1923.

(Signed) Percy G. B. Gilkes, Clerk.
(SEAL). (Signed) J.G.Cochran, Deputy Clerk."

and moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the ninth rule.

And it appearing to the Court that the plaintiff in error has failed to have its cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court.

It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, docketed and dismissed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. B. Smyth et al., Appellants,
621. vs.
Asphalt Belt Railway Company et al.
Kelley for the appellants.

The motion for a temporary injunction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert H.

George D. Hile, a Taxpayer,
Plaintiff in Error,
370. vs.
The City of Cleveland.

The motion to advance was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. J. Gerrity in that behalf.

Fidelity & Columbia Trust Company et al., etc.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
434. vs.
The Commonwealth of Kentucky.

The motion to advance was submitted by Mr. Wilfred Hearn in that behalf.

Thomas A. Delaney, Petitioner,
354. vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance and to admit the petitioner herein to bail was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Otto A. Schlobohm in behalf of counsel for the petitioner.

Ex parte In the matter of L. Santiago Carmona et al., composing the Members of the Workmen's Relief Commission of Porto Rico, et al.,
No. Original. Petitioners.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. Granville Munson and Mr. Grant T. Trent for the petitioners.

The United States of America,
Complainant,
No. 22, Original. vs.
The State of Minnesota.

On motion of Mr. C. R. Pierce, counsel for the defendant, leave was granted to file the answers herein.

The United States of America,
Complainant,
No. 24, Original. vs.
The State of Minnesota.

Denison-Pratt Paper Company, Petitioner,
576. vs.
News Publishing Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles D. Merrick and Mr. Buford C. Tynes for the petitioner, and by Mr. C. M. Hanna for the respondent.

C. V. Browne, Petitioner,
594. vs.
The Union Pacific Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ray Campbell for the petitioner, and by Mr. N. H. Loomis and Mr. T. M. Lillard for the respondent.

Pete Salkovich, by Kosta Unkovich, Attorney in Fact, Petitioner,
595. vs.
Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William M. Williams for the petitioner, and by Mr. Warren H. Pillsbury for the respondent.

Barney McCourtney et al., Petitioners,
598. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John M. Cleary for the petitioners.

Joseph G. Heintz, Petitioner,
599. vs.
The United States of America.
Max Smithberger, Petitioner,
600. vs.
The United States of America.
Joliet Citizens Brewing Company, Petitioner,
601. vs.
The United States of America.
Oscar Weinbrod, Petitioner,
602. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank J. Jones for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Dovan Chemical Corporation, Petitioner,
617. vs.
National Aniline & Chemical Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James R. Sheffield and Mr. Drury W. Cooper for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles H. Otis for the respondent.

Theodore DeWitt, Petitioner,
620. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Ben B. Wickham

for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

W. Fish Wilson, County Collector of Taxes etc., et al., Appellants,
131. vs.
Illinois Southern Railway Company et al.

The motion to dismiss, or to transfer this cause to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, pursuant to the Act of Congress of September 14, 1922, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George B. Gillespie for the appellees in support of the motion, and by Mr. June C. Smith for the appellants in opposition thereto.

Harry Ryan et al., Petitioners,
196. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioners to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Venancio Concepcion, Petitioner,
234. vs.
The People of the Philippine Islands.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel Greenberg et al., Petitioners,
287. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioners to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause has

been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Aetna Life Insurance Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
325. vs.
Mrs. Pearl Stone Dunken, Administratrix etc.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. A. Boynton for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. W. J. Moroney for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

C. E. Gaines, Petitioner,
372. vs.
The State of Texas.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Criminal Appeals of the State of Texas.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Doran Chemical Corporation, Petitioner,
617. vs.
National Aniline & Chemical Company.

On motion of counsel in that behalf, leave was granted to file briefs herein as amici curiae.

The United States of America et al.,
Appellants,
40. vs.
Illinois Central Railroad Company et al.
Wyoming Railway Company, Appellant,
38. vs.
The United States of America et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the United States of America, and continued by Mr. R. V. Fletcher for Illinois Central Railroad Company.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert V. Fletcher, It is ordered that Donald Evans, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James M. Sheridan, It is ordered that James Owen Sword, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert E. Barry, It is ordered that Watts T. Estabrook, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert E. Barry, It is ordered that Dwight B. Galt, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chester A. Gwinn, It is ordered that John P. Garvin, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Domingo Dias A, et al., Appellants,
113. vs.
Guillermo Patterson.

The motion to pass this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter S. Penfield in behalf of counsel; and the motion denied.

The Kansas Natural Gas Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
133. vs.
The State of Kansas ex rel. A. E. Helm, Attorney etc.

The State of Missouri ex rel. Jesse W. Barrett, Attorney General, et al.,
Appellants,
155. vs.
Kansas Natural Gas Company.

The motion to consolidate these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. O. Caster in that behalf.

Ex parte In the matter of The Transportes Maritimos do Estado, a Department of the Government of the Republic of Portugal,
No.26, Original. Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion of counsel for the petitioner in the above entitled case for a stay of execution and to maintain the status quo of this case pending the disposition of the rule to show cause, returnable on Monday, January seventh next,

It is now here ordered by this Court that a stay of execution of the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York be, and the same is hereby, granted; and the status quo of this case be maintained until further order of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States et al., Appellants,
40. vs.
Illinois Central Railroad Company et al.
Wyoming Railway Company, Appellant,
38. vs.
The United States et al.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. R. V. Fletcher for the Illinois Central Railroad Company, by Mr. Garner Wynn Green for the Fernwood Columbia & Gulf Railroad Company, by Mr. H. C. Lutkin for the Wyoming

Railway Company, and concluded by Mr. J. Carter Fort for the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The City of Winfield,
Plaintiff in Error,
105. vs.
Court of Industrial Relations et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. A. M. Jackson for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

William T. Price et al.
Plaintiffs in Error,
106. vs.
Magnolia Petroleum Company et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. E. E. Blake for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. B. B. Blakeney for the Magnolia Petroleum Company, by Mr. George E. Merritt for Commissioners of the Land Office of Oklahoma, and by Mr. A. T. Boys for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Bernard F. Garvey, It is ordered that Harold G. Manning, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. M. Hewlett, It is ordered that Karl F. Phillips, Esquire, of Wheeling, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

William T. Price et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
106. vs.
Magnolia Petroleum Company et al.

The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. A. T. Boys for the plaintiffs in error.

Cudahy Packing Company of Nebraska,
Plaintiff in Error,
107 vs.
Mary Ann Parramore, etc., et al.

This case was argued by Mr. George T. Buckingham for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. J. Robert Robinson for the defendants in error.

Guaranty Title & Trust Company, Receiver etc., Appellant,
109. vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. E. R. F. Wells for the appellant, continued by Mr. H. H. Rumble for the Norfolk-Hampton Roads Company, one of the appellees, and concluded by Mr. E. R. F. Wells for the appellant.

Red Cross Line, Petitioner,
112. vs.
Atlantic Fruit Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Homer L. Loomis for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry F. Ashurst, It is ordered that George Pierce Stovall, Esquire, of Superior, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick W. Lehmann, It is ordered that L. Claude Pottrell, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Andrews, It is ordered that Clifton P. Williamson, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Young Men's Christian Association of Columbus, Ohio, et al., Petitioners,
249. vs.
Ora Davis et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., for the petitioners.

J. B. Smyth et al., Appellants,
621. vs.
Asphalt Belt Railway Company et al.

The motion to advance this cause to the consideration of the Court was submitted by Mr. Robert H. Kelley for the appellants.

The motion for leave to file certain certified documents herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert H. Kelley for the appellants.

Red Cross Line, Petitioner,
112. vs.
Atlantic Fruit Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. J. W. Crandall for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. H. L. Loomis for the petitioner.

Sven Haavik, Appellant,
128. vs.
Alaska Packers' Association.

This cause was argued by Mr. H. W. Hutton for the appellant, and by Mr. John Rustgard for the appellee.

Alfred Street, suing on behalf of himself and others, etc., et al.,
Appellants,
156. vs.
Shipowners' Association of the Pacific Coast et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. H. W. Hutton for the appellants, and by Mr. Warren Olney for the appellees.

Clallam County, Washington, et al.,
255. vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Thomas P. Trumbull for Clallam County, Washington, et al., continued by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for The United States, and concluded by Mr. John V. Fletcher for Clallam County, Washington, et al.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Fowler, It is ordered that William R. Benham, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert M. Erskine, It is ordered that Edward T. Pares, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert M. Erskine, It is ordered that F. William Kraft, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Fowler, It is ordered that Henry Anderson Guiler, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Fowler, It is ordered that Grove Johnson Fink, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Fowler, It is ordered that Stanley W. Finch, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Francis Carusi, It is ordered that Celestino Dominguez y Burio, Esquire, of Guayama, Porto Rico, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Canute Steamship Company, Limited, et al., Petitioners,
72. vs.
Pittsburgh & West Virginia Coal Company, et al.

On motion of Mr. Thomas F. Barrett, counsel for the respondents, the mandate in this cause was granted, the petitioners not objecting.

The United States, Appellant,
331. vs.
New York Coffee & Sugar Exchange, Inc., et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. James A. Fowler for the appellant, continued by Mr. William Mason Smith and Mr. John W. Davis for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Seymour for the appellant.

Dayton-Goose Creek Railway Company, Appellant,
330. vs.
The United States et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf, forty minutes' additional time was allowed to each side for the argument of this cause. On motion of Mr. Forney Johnston in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae. On motion of Mr. Frank Andrews, counsel for the appellant, leave was granted to file a brief herein in reply to the brief as amicus curiae on or before Monday, November 26th. The ar-

gument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Frank Andrews for the appellant, and continued by Mr. P. J. Farrell for the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph T. Davis, It is ordered that Douglas W. Robert, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. P. J. Farrell, It is ordered that Ralph H. Kimball, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Cox, It is ordered that Raymond G. Wright, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Cox, It is ordered that Eugene R. West, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. M. Shortridge, Esquire, It is ordered that F. M. Angellotti, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

U. S. Webb, as Attorney General of the State of California, and C. C. Coolidge, as District Attorney of Santa Clara County, State of California,

Appellants,

26. vs.

J. J. O'Brien and J. Inouye.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Mr. Justice McReynolds and Mr. Justice Brandeis think there is no justiciable question involved, and that the case should have been dismissed on that ground.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Raymond L. Frick and M. Satow,

Appellants,

111. vs.

U. S. Webb, as Attorney General of the State of California, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this

cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Mr. Justice McReynolds and Mr. Justice Brandeis think there is no justiciable question involved, and that the case should have been dismissed on that ground.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Charles G. Binderup,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Pathe Exchange, Inc., Pathe Exchange, Inc., of Nebraska, Exhibitors Mutual Distributing Corporation, et al.

77. In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Security Savings Bank,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State of California.

21. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Charles L. Craig, Petitioner,

Petitioner,

82. vs.

William C. Hecht, United States Marshal for the Southern District of New York.

On writ of certicrari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York with directions to vacate the order releasing petitioner; discharge the writ; and take such further proceedings as may be necessary to carry the opinion of this Court into effect.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Concurring:
Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes,
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Eli Bunch, Plaintiff in Error,

33. vs.

J. B. Cole and T. B. Mathews.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

It is further ordered that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed. (See order of January 28,1924).

Per Mr.Justice Van Devanter.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

The State of New Jersey, Complainant, No. __, Original. vs. Harry M. Daugherty, Attorney General of the United States, et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and that process issue returnable on Monday, January 21st next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. B. Smyth et al., Appellants, 621. vs. Asphalt Belt Railway Company et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file documents in support of the motion for an injunction herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. B. Smyth et al., Appellants, 621. vs. Asphalt Belt Railway Company et al.

On consideration of the motion for a temporary injunction herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. B. Smyth et al., Appellants, 621. vs. Asphalt Belt Railway Company et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of L. Santiago Carmona et al., No. __, Original. Petitioners.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Liang Sung Wan, Petitioner,

451. vs.

The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 7th next, at the head of the call for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel. St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company,

Plaintiff in Error,

398. vs.

Interstate Commerce Commission et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 21st next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Young Men's Christian Association, of Columbus, Ohio, et al., Petitioners,

249. vs.

Ora Davis et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument with No. 276, on Monday, January 7th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Ohio ex rel. George S. Hawke,

Plaintiff in Error,

545. vs.

Robert A. Le Blond, as Presiding Judge of the Court of Common Pleas of Hamilton County, Ohio.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft..

The State of Ohio ex rel. George S. Hawke,

Plaintiff in Error,

545. vs.

Robert A. Le Blond, as Presiding Judge of the Court of Common Pleas of Hamilton County, Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Ohio ex rel. George S. Hawke,
Plaintiff in Error,
545. vs.
Robert A. Le Blond, as Presiding Judge of the Court of Common Pleas of Hamilton County, Ohio.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Crew Levick Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
518. vs.
The City of Philadelphia to the use of J. Joseph McHugh.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George D. Hile, a Taxpayer,
Plaintiff in Error,
370. vs.
The City of Cleveland.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fidelity & Columbia Trust Company et al., Administratorx etc.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
434. vs.
The Commonwealth of Kentucky.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas A. Delaney, Petitioner,
354. vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause transferred to the summary docket and assigned for

December 31 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas A. Delaney, Petitioner,

354. vs.

The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to admit the petitioner to bail, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,

Appellant,

314. vs.

Roger B. Wood, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Eastern Shore Shipbuilding Corporation.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. Fish Wilson, County Collector etc., et al.,

Appellants,

131. vs.

Illinois Southern Railway Company et al.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or transfer this cause to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Aetna Life Insurance Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,

325. vs.

Mrs. Pearl Stone Dunken, Administratrix etc.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John D. Flanagan, Petitioner,
346. vs.
Federal Coal Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William M. Barrett, as President of the Adams Express Company, Petitioner,
528. vs.
Arthur H. Van Pelt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Denison-Pratt Paper Company, Petitioner,
576. vs.
News Publishing Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Barney McCourtney et al., Petitioners,
598. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dovan Chemical Corporation,
Petitioner,
617. vs.
National Aniline & Chemical Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Theodore DeWitt, Petitioner,
620. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The City of Winfield,
Plaintiff in Error,
105. vs.
Court of Industrial Relations, Public Utilities Commission of the State of Kansas, substituted defendant, and Public Utilities Commission of the State of Kansas.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel. Nicolai Menservich,
Appellant,
148. vs.
Robert E. Tod, Commissioner of Immigration etc.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. George Ross Hull for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. Isaac Shorr and Mr. Walter Nelles for the appellant in opposition thereto.

William Leather et al., Appellants,
172. vs.
Mark J. White.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Ottinger for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. George C. Wilbur for the appellants in opposition thereto.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
559. vs.
Ninety-five Barrels, more or less, Alleged Apple Cider Vinegar, et al.

The motion to advance in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
644. vs.
Prince Line, Limited.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
645. vs.
American Hawaiian Steamship Company.

The motion to vacate the judgments docketing and dismissing these cases, and to enlarge the time for docketing the writs of error, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the plaintiff in error.

The United States ex rel. Melida A. Durnford,
Plaintiff in Error,
173. vs.
Albert B. Fall, Secretary of the Interior.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck, it was ordered that Hubert Work, present Secretary of the Interior, be substituted as the party

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
15, Original. vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant;
The United States, intervener.

The motion for leave to file a petition of Charles West for leave to intervene in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. A. Severance in that behalf; with leave to Mr. Solicitor General Beck to file a reply thereto on or before Friday next.

The United States, Appellant,
87. vs.
William W. Slaymaker.

On motion of Mr. George A. King for the appellee, the mandate in this cause was granted.

Tidal Oil Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
179. vs.
J. P. Flanagan.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward H. Chandler and Mr. William O. Beall for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Preston C. West, Mr. A. A. Davidson, Mr. Wallace C. Franklin, and Mr. Arthur J. Biddison for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Canute Steamship Company, Limited, et al.,
Petitioners,
72. vs.
Pittsburgh & West Virginia Coal Company et al.

On motion of Mr. D. M. Tibbetts for the respondents, the issuance of the mandate was withheld until the expiration of the time prescribed by the rule.

Oliver Oil Gas Burner and Machine Company,
Petitioner,
619. vs.
International Heating Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wilbur B. Jones, Mr. S. W. Fordyce, and Mr. Thomas W. White for the petitioners, and by Mr. Frederick W. Lehmann for the respondents.

Ex parte In the matter of Michael Quinn,
12, Original. Petitioner.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the petition for a writ of mandamus herein has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of the said motion, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hans Heidner, Petitioner,
613. vs.
St. Paul & Tacoma Lumber Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Guy E. Kelley for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. T. S. Lyle for the respondent.

Dayton-Goose Creek Railway Company, Appellant,
330. vs.
The United States of America et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for The United States of America, and concluded by Mr. Robert J. Carey for the appellant.

Ex parte In the matter of The United States of America, as Owner of Nineteen Barges and Four Towboats,
23,
Original. Petitioner,

The argument on the return to the rule to show cause was commenced by Mr. Lon O. Hooker for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Joseph T. Davis for the respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter Bruce Howe, It is ordered that Robert Elmer More, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. Parker Jones, It is ordered that Charles James Lane, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Everett Dufour, It is ordered that James J. Johnston, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Ex parte In the matter of The United States of America, as Owner of Nineteen Barges, etc., 23, Original. Petitioner.

The argument of this cause on the return to the rule to show cause was continued by Mr. Joseph T. Davis and Mr. Douglas W. Robert for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Lon O. Hocker for the petitioner.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Complainant,
15, Original., vs.
O. T.1922.
The State of West Virginia.

The State of Ohio, Complainant,
16, Original, vs.
O. T.1922.
The State of West Virginia.

Three hours were allowed for the reargument of these cases.

The reargument of these cases was commenced by Mr. John W. Davis for the complainants, continued by Mr. P. P. Steptoe and Mr. G. M. Hoffheimer for the defendant, and concluded by Mr. George E. Alter for the complainant The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Peoria & Pekin Union Railway Company, Appellant,
318. vs.
The United States et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. R. V. Fletcher for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert H. McNeill, It is ordered that Leo A. Weisskopf, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert H. McNeill, It is ordered that Julius L. Steiner, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Burton K. Wheeler, It is ordered that Walter S. Wheeler, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred Hayes, It is ordered that Robert F. Greacen, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, It is ordered that Otto B. Rupp, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry F. Ashurst, It is ordered that Kirke T. Moore, Esquire, of Tucson, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

St. Johns, N. F., Shipping Corporation, Owner etc., Petitioner,
43. vs.
S. A. Companhia Geral Commercial do Rio de Janeiro.

On motion of Mr. Blackburn Esterline in that behalf, the mandate in this cause was granted.

Edward A. Thurston, Sole Surviving Trustee etc., Petitioner,
213. vs.
Benjamin Brown et al.

Upon suggestion of the death of Edward A. Thurston, and on motion of Mr. Spencer Gordon for the petitioner, Henry V. Cunningham, Successor as Trustee, was substituted as the party petitioner herein.

Peoria & Pekin Union Railway Company, Appellant,
318. vs.
The United States et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. R. V. Fletcher for the appellant, by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for The United States, by Mr. R. Granville Curry for the Interstate Commerce Commission, by Mr. Donald Evans for the Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad Company, and concluded by Mr. Robert V. Fletcher for the appellant.

First National Bank of St. Louis, Plaintiff in Error,
252. vs.
The State of Missouri at the information of Jesse W. Barrett, Attorney General.

Three counsel were allowed to argue for the defendant in error.
Three hours were allowed for the reargument of this cause.
The reargument of this cause was commenced by Mr. F. H. Sullivan for the plaintiff in error, continued by

Mr. Solicitor General Beck for The United States as amicus curiae, by Mr. Jesse W. Barrett and Mr. Robert C. Morris for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 22, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Davis, It is ordered that Pierre A. White, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick W. Lehmann, It is ordered that Vance J. Higgs, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jerry C. South, It is ordered that H. H. Larimore, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Harr, It is ordered that C. W. Cornell, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Davis, It is ordered that I. Lawrence Broadwin, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Federal Trade Commission et al.,
Appellants,
250. vs.
Claire Furnace Company et al.

On motion of Mr. Levi Cooke in that behalf, leave was granted Mr. R. C. Leffingwell to withdraw his appearance for the appellees in this cause.

First National Bank in St. Louis,
Plaintiff in Error,
252. vs.
The State of Missouri at the information of Jesse W. Barrett, Attorney General.

The reargument of this cause was continued by Mr. Frederick W. Lehmann for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. C. A. Severance for the plaintiff in error.

Railroad Commission of the State of California, Petitioner,
283. vs.
Southern Pacific Company et al.

Railroad Commission of the State of California, Petitioner,
284. vs.
The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company.

Railroad Commission of the State of California, Petitioner,
285. vs.
Los Angeles & Salt Lake Railroad Company.

The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. William W. Clary for the petitioner, continued by Mr. C. W. Durbrow for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Hugh Gordon for the petitioners.

National Association of Window Glass Manufacturers et al.,
Appellants,
353. vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. John W. Davis for the appellants, and continued by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 23, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. A. Heitmuller, It is ordered that William W. Bearman, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Charles Claflin Allen, Jr., Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edmund B. Quiggle, It is ordered that C. Sophus Johnson, Esquire, of Grand Rapids, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
644. vs.
Prince Line, Limited.
The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
645. vs.
American Hawaiian Steamship Company.

On motion of Mr. Cletus Keating in that behalf, leave was granted to file opposition to motion to vacate order docketing and dismissing the writs of error in these cases, on or before Thursday next.

National Association of Window Glass Manufacturers et al., Appellants,
353. vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Pierre A. White for the appellants.

Benjamin Gitlow,
Plaintiff in Error,
182. vs.
The People of the State of New York.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Walter H. Pollak for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. John Caldwell Myers for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. W. J. Wetherbee for the defendant in error.

Corona Coal Company, Appellant,
42. vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Forney Johnston for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard P. Ernst, It is ordered that David Lorbach, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio; Leonard Garver, Jr., Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio; and Joseph B. Matre, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, It is ordered that Arthur J. Freund, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Philip Pitt Campbell, It is ordered that Ernest B. Weatherly, Esquire, of Macon, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles F. Consaul, It is ordered that John T. Watkins, Esquire, of Minden, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Claude R. Porter, It is ordered that Thomas R. Charshee, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence M. Goodwin, It is ordered that H. Raymund Brennahan, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry R. Gower, It is ordered that William A. Eggers, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., It is ordered that Arthur E. Weil, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. R. Prince, It is ordered that Charles J. Rixey, Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia, and J. T. Stokely, Esquire, of Birmingham, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. Catesby Jones, It is ordered that Theodore M. Hoguembourg, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

John Brosnan, Jr., Mary Bramhall, Irene McCarthy, et al.
56. vs.
Margaret E. Brosnan.

On a certificate from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that in the District of Columbia, under a caveat to a will challenging the mental capacity of the testator, whether before or after the will has been admitted to probate, the burden of proof on the issue whether the testator at the time of executing the will was of sound and disposing mind and capable of executing a valid deed or contract, is upon the caveator.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Clallam County, Washington; William A. Nelson, Sheriff of Clallam County, Washington; E. C. Stewart, Treasurer of Clallam County, Washington, et al.,

255. vs.

The United States of America and United States Spruce Production Corporation.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the first question certified must be answered in the affirmative; and that the second question certified must be answered in the negative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Alfred Street, suing on behalf of himself and all other Seamen engaged in Interstate and Foreign Commerce by Sea, etc.,

Appellant,

156. vs.

Shipowners Association of the Pacific Coast and Pacific American Steamship Association.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, transferred to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, pursuant to the Act of Congress of September 14, 1922.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
15, Original. vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant;
The United States, Intervener.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition in intervention of Charles West in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
559. vs.
Ninety-five Cases, more or less,
Alleged Apple Cider Vinegar, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and the cause placed on the summary docket, and assigned for argument on Monday, March 3d next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel. Nicolai Menservich,
Appellant,
148. vs.
Robert E. Tod, Commissioner of Immigration etc.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

It is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, advanced and placed on the summary docket, and assigned for argument on Monday, December 3d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Leather and Leon E. Lee,
Appellants,
172. vs.
Mark J. White.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed

until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

It is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, advanced and placed on the summary docket, and assigned for argument on Monday, December 10th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. V. Browne, Petitioner,
594. vs.
The Union Pacific Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oliver Oil Gas Burner and Machine Company, Petitioner,
619. vs.
International Heating Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Brosman, Jr., et al.,
56. vs.
Margaret E. Brosman.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the words "the whole record to be considered; and" in the entry of October 8th, 1923, as to the hearing of this case, having been inadvertently entered, be, and the same are hereby, stricken out.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced that the Court will take a recess from Wednesday, November 28th, until Monday, December 3d next.

Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis et al., Appellants,
425. vs.
The United States of America et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellees.

Joshua W. Miles, formerly United States Collector etc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
311. vs.
Samuel J. Graham.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the plaintiff in error.

First National Bank of Columbus, Ohio, Appellant,
509. vs.
Louisiana Highway Commission et al.

The motion to affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. J. Wilson in behalf of Mr. W. M. Barrow for the appellees in support of the motion.

I. Goto et al., Appellants,
463. vs.
John C. Lane, High Sheriff etc.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. Hardy Todd for the appellants.

Twin Falls Salmon River Land & Water Company et al.,
Appellants,
19. vs.
A. E. Caldwell et al.

The suggestion of diminution of the record and the motion for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. K. Nebeker in that behalf.

Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, Petitioner,
607. vs.
Southern Pacific Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the motions (1) that the order of this Court on November 12, 1923, granting a petition for a writ of certiorari be restricted to the respondents Southern Pacific Company and Director General

claimants against whom no error is assigned in the petition; and/or (2) that the transcript of record be diminished by at least 500 pages so as to include only evidence bearing directly or indirectly on the errors of law assigned in the petition and brief for certiorari.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
15, Original. vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant;
The United States, Intervener.

On motion of Mr. John S. Flannery in that behalf, the Eleventh Report of the Receiver herein was received and filed.

Henry Kellman, Plaintiff in Error,
157. vs.
The City of St. Louis.

The motion to reinstate the writ of error in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James T. Lloyd in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company, Appellant,
656. vs.
Joe H. Strain, Bank Commissioner of the State of Oklahoma, et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. C. Brandenburg in that behalf.

Panama Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
369. vs.
Andrew Johnson,
in, as amici curiae.

On motion of Mr. Theodore M. Hequembourg in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of John M. Woolsey and Vernon S. Jones herein, as amici curiae.

Sallie Canard, Plaintiff in Error,
660. vs.
R. E. Snell, Jr., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by Mr. Lewis C. Lawson for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition, with leave to file printed record hereafter.

Kwock Sou Lum, Petitioner,
650. vs.
Edward White, as Commissioner of Immigration etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. Walton Henry for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Illinois Fuel Company, Petitioner,
654. vs.
Walter G. Space, doing business under the name and style of Space Coal Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel W. Baxter and Mr. Henry G. Miller for the petitioner, and by Mr. John L. Flannigen for the respondent.

Christine Walters, Petitioner,
661. vs.
John Barton Payne, Agent.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clarence Balentine for the petitioner.

J. Harrod Lehmann,
Plaintiff in Error,
170. vs.
State Board of Public Accountancy et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. J. Mayfield for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Erle Pettus for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Dora E. Rooker et al., Appellants,
295. vs.
Fidelity Trust Company.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles E. Cox for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. William Velpeau Rooker for the appellants in opposition thereto.

Michael Heitler, Petitioner,
387. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Nathaniel Perlman, Petitioner,
388. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mandel Greenberg, Petitioner,
389. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Corona Coal Company, Appellant,
42. vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Forney Johnston for the appellant, and concluded by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the appellee.

Board of Trade of the City of Chicago, Petitioner,
90. vs.
E. H. Johnson, Trustee etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. Henry S. Robbins for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert N. Erskine for the respondent.

John Maynard Harlan, Appellant,
104. vs.
James S. Harlan.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Henry E. Davis for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otis Beall Kent, It is ordered that John L. McMaster, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter H. Newton, It is ordered that Allen A. Atwood, Esquire, of St. Cloud, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Pacific Gas & Electric Company,
Appellant,
34. vs.
The City and County of San Francisco.

Pacific Gas & Electric Company,
Appellant,
35. vs.
The City and County of San Francisco et al.

Pacific Gas & Electric Company,
Appellant,
36. vs.
The City and County of San Francisco et al.

It is now here ordered by this Court that these cases be, and they are hereby, restored to the docket for reargument, and assigned for hearing on Monday, February 18th next, preceding the other cases from the Ninth Circuit heretofore assigned for that day.

John Maynard Hanlan, Appellant,
104. vs.
James S. Harlan.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Henry E. Davis for the appellant, and by Mr. Henry S. Robbins for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Henry E. Davis for the appellant.

Thomas W. McCarthy, United States Marshal etc., Appellant,
404, O.T.1922. vs.
Jules W. Arndstein.

This cause was reargued by Mr. Selden Bacon for the National Surety Company; and submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Saul S. Myers, and Mr. Walter H. Pollak for the appellant, by Mr. Lindley M. Garrison for American Surety Company et al., and by Mr. W. Randolph Montgomery for the National Association of Credit Men, and by Mr. William J. Fallon for the appellee.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
102. vs.
Raymond Bros.-Clark Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Adrien F. Busick for the petitioner. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Washington-Southern Navigation Company,
108. vs.
Baltimore & Philadelphia Steamboat Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Arthur E. Weil for Washington-Scuthern Navigation Company.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

*

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merrill Moores, It is ordered that Oscar H. Montgomery, Esquire, of Seymour, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Davis, It is ordered that Clay C. Rogers, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Oscar R. Houston, It is ordered that George S. Brengle, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter H. Newton, It is ordered that Thomas E. Atkinson, Esquire, of Grand Rapids, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Thomas Taylor, It is ordered that Benjamin H. Schwartz, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry L. Underwood, It is ordered that William T. Carden, Esquire, of Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter H. Newton, It is ordered that Olger B. Burtness, Esquire, of Grand Forks, State of North Dakota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Washington-Southern Navigation Company,
108. vs.
Baltimore & Philadelphia Steamboat Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Arthur E. Weil for Washington-Southern Navigation Company, and concluded by Mr. Thomas Raeburn White for Baltimore & Philadelphia Steamboat Company.

Southern Power Company, Petitioner,
110. vs.
North Carolina Public Service Company et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. R. V. Lindabury for the petitioner, continued by Mr. John W. Davis and Mr. A. L. Brooks for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. William P. Bynum for the petitioner.

Domingo Diaz A et al., Appellants,
113. vs.
Guillermo Patterson.

This cause was argued by Mr. William H. Jackson for the appellants, and by Mr. E. T. Merrick for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

* On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merrill Moores, It is ordered that Cassius W. McMullen, Esquire, of Aurora, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Abraham H. Rubenstein, It is ordered that Vincent T. Follmar, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Vernon E. West, It is ordered that Otto Erwin Koegel, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Vernon E. West, It is ordered that Carl F. von dem Bussche, Esquire, of Missoula, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Egbert F. Halstead, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chauncey E. Richardson, It is ordered that Roy F. Wrigley, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Riley R. Cloud, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston, It is ordered that J. W. Benson, Esquire, of Henderson, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas W. Davis, It is ordered that F. L. Willcox, Esquire, of Florence, State of South Carolina; and R. E. Whiting, Esquire, of Florence, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George A. King, It is ordered that Seth T. Cole, Esquire, of Catskill, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

King County, Washington,
Appellant,
30. vs.
Seattle School District No. 1.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the

District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Complainant,
15, vs. (Oct.Term,1922).
Original. The State of West Virginia.

ON REHEARING.

The State of Ohio, Complainant,
16. vs. (Oct.Term,1922).
Original. The State of West Virginia.

It is ordered by this Court that the opinion delivered and decree entered herein on June 11th, 1923, be, and the same are hereby, reaffirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

The Chief Justice did not participate in the consideration of the cases on the rehearing.

Mr. Justice Holmes, Mr. Justice McReynolds, and Mr. Justice Brandeis dissent, for the reasons given in their dissenting opinions at the last term.

W. H. Hightower, B. A. Wright, C.H. Andrew, et al.,
Appellants,
25. vs.
The American National Bank of Macon, Georgia.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Georgia.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,

644. vs.

Prince Line, Limited.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,

645. vs.

American Hawaiian Steamship Company.

On consideration of the motion to vacate the judgments docketing and dismissing the writs of error in these cases, and to enlarge the time for docketing the cases,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry Kellman, Plaintiff in Error,

157. vs.

The City of St. Louis.

On consideration of the motion to reinstate the writ of error in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,

15, Original. vs.

The State of Texas,
Defendant;
The United States of America,
Intervener.

It is ordered by this Court that the Eleventh Report of the Receiver herein be, and the same is hereby, received and filed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis et al.,
Appellants,

425. vs.

The United States of America et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 25th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

I. Goto et al., Appellants,

463. vs.

John C. Lane, High Sheriff etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 18th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company, Appellant,
656. vs.
Joe H. Strain, Bank Commissioner of the State of Oklahoma, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,
It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 18th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joshua W. Miles, formerly United States Collector etc., Plaintiff in Error,
311. vs.
Samuel J. Graham.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,
It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Twin Falls Salmon River Land & Water Company et al., Appellants,
19. vs.
A. E. Caldwell et al.

On suggestion of diminution of the record, It is now here ordered by this Court that the motion for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, granted; the papers brought up to be regarded as part of the record, subject to objection.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph G. Heintz, Petitioner,
599. vs.
The United States of America.
Max Smithberger, Petitioner,
600. vs.
The United States of America.
Joliet Citizens Brewing Company, Petitioner,
601. vs.
The United States of America.
Oscar Weinbrod, Petitioner,
602. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writs of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kwock Sau Lum, Petitioner,
650. vs.
Edward White, as Commissioner of Immigration etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Illinois Fuel Company,
Petitioner,
654. vs.
Walter G. Space, doing business under the name and style of Space Coal Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Christine Walters,
Petitioner,
661. vs.
John Barton Payne, Agent.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Maynard Harlan, Appellant,
104. vs.
James S. Harlan.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals with directions to modify its previous decree and enter an order remanding the cause to the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia directing it to dismiss the case as moot, awarding no costs to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

ORDER. Court will take a recess from Monday, December 10th, to Wednesday, January 2d, next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas A. Delaney, Petitioner,
354. vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the respondent, this cause was reassigned for Wednesday, January 2d next. The motion for bail was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Elijah N. Zoline for the petitioner; and the motion denied.

The United States of America et al., Appellants,
456. vs.
Abilene & Southern Railway Company et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellants.

Great Northern Railway Company, Petitioner,
209. vs.
McCaull-Dinsmore Company.

On motion of Mr. John J. Finerty in that behalf, this cause was assigned for argument with Nos. 114, 122 and 123, on Monday, February 18th next.

Great Northern Railway Company, Petitioner,
209. vs.
McCaull-Dinsmore Company.

On motion of Mr. John J. Finerty for the Director General of Railroads, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

Helen C. Frick, Plaintiff in Error,
442. vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Helen C. Frick, Plaintiff in Error,
443. vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Adelaide H. C. Frick et al., etc.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
444. vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Adelaide H. C. Frick et al., etc.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
445. vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

On motion of Mr. Seth T. Cole in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of The State of New York herein as amicus curiae.

E. E. Goodno, Plaintiff in Error,
256. vs.
South Florida Farms Company.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Daniel Thew Wright and Mr. W. Russell Osborne for the defendant in error in support of the motion.

E. J. Finneran, Petitioner,
664. vs.
William J. Burton, Trustee etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted by Mr. Charles Ray Dean and Mr. Luther Ely Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. Forrest C. Donnell for the respondent.

The Home Telephone and Telegraph Company of Spokane, Appellant,
539. vs.
E. V. Kuykendall, as Director of Public Works of Washington, et al., etc., et al.

The Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Company, Appellant,
540. vs.
E. V. Kuykendall, as Director of Public Works of Washington, et al., etc., et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John H. Ray in that behalf.

The State of Missouri ex rel. Jesse W. Barrett, Attorney General, et al.,
Appellants,
155. vs.
Kansas Natural Gas Company.

On motion of Mr. Clarence Miller in that behalf, this cause was passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26.

James Everard's Breweries, Appellant,
200. vs.
Ralph A. Day, Prohibition Director etc., et al.

On motion of Mr. Martin A. Schenck in behalf of Dr. Samuel W. Lambert, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

Home Telephone and Telegraph Company, of Spokane, Appellant,
539. vs.
E. V. Kuykendall, as Director of Public Works of Washington, et al., etc., et al.

The Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Company, Appellant,
540. vs.
E. V. Kuykendall, as Director of Public Works of Washington, et al., etc., et al.

The motion to postpone the consideration of the motion to advance and to consolidate these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Blaine Mallan in that behalf.

Commonwealth of Australia et al., Petitioners,
623. vs.
John L. McLean, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Patterson-MacDonald Shipbuilding Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Corwin S. Shank for the petitioners, and by Mr. Ira Bronson and Mr. H. B. Jones for the respondent.

Robert Berryman, Petitioner,
629. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles M. Bryan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant to the Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Jake Tuckerman, Petitioner,
630. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles M. Bryan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant ~~to the~~ Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Joe Robilio et al., Petitioners,
631. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles M. Bryan for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Loftis Wilkes et al., Petitioners,
632. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles M. Bryan for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Board of Directors of Miller Levee District No. 2, Appellants,
634. vs.
Prairie Pipe Line Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry Moore, Jr., for the appellants in support of the petition.

Fort Smith Light & Traction Company, Plaintiff in Error,
646. vs.
Fagan Bourland et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph M. Hill and Mr. Henry L. Fitzhugh for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition.

Wabash Railway Company,
Petitioner,
649. vs.
Samuel T. Hoff.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Homer Hall for the petitioner, and by Mr. Clay C. Rogers and Mr. Cyrus Crane for the respondent.

The People of the State of New York, Petitioner,
352. vs.
Louis Jersawit, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Ajax Dress Company.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Robert P. Beyer and Mr. Claude T. Dawes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry B. Singer for the respondent.

The State of Georgia, Complainant,
21.
Original. vs.
The City of Chattanooga.

The argument of this cause on the motion to dismiss was commenced by Mr. Sam E. Whitaker for the defendant in support of the motion, continued by Mr. George M. Napier for the complainant in opposition to the motion, and concluded by Mr. William L. Frierson for the complainant in opposition to the motion.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
62. vs.
California Midway Oil Company et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. H. L. Underwood for the appellant, and submitted by Mr. George E. Whitaker and Mr. U. T. Clotfelter for the appellees.

The Baltimore & Ohio Southwestern Railroad Company, Petitioner,
115. vs.
Lula Burtch, Administratrix etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William A. Eggers for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Oscar H. Montgomery for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 4, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

Willis Van Devanter,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

George Sutherland,

Pierce Butler,

Edward T. Sanford,

Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick P. Fish, It is ordered that Edward L. Logan, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts; and Daniel J. Lyne, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Andrieus A. Jones, It is ordered that Milton J. Helmick, Esquire, of Albuquerque, State of New Mexico, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Ross Hull, It is ordered that Daniel Webster, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William M. Vaile, It is ordered that Charles S. Witwer, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. M. Stockslager, It is ordered that Harry F. Riley, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry F. Ashurst, It is ordered that Charles Wickham Jones, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick P. Fish, It is ordered that J. Lewis Stackpole, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earl C. Michener, It is ordered that Bird J. Vincent, of Saginaw, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. Anton Heitmuller, It is ordered that Jeremiah E. O'Connell, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island; and Charles S. Finklestein, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earl C. Michener, It is ordered that Glenn B. Warner, Esquire, of Pau Pau, State of Michigan; and William L. Fitzgerald, Esquire, of Kalamazoo, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert W. Blair, It is ordered that Frank Chandler Sibley, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter E. Newton, It is ordered that Paul J. Thompson, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Baltimore & Ohio Southwestern Railroad Company, Petitioner,
115. vs.
Lula Burton, Administratrix etc.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Oscar H. Montgomery for the respondent.

George Carroll et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
117. vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. Thomas E. Atkinson for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Crim for the defendant in error.

James C. Davis, as Agent etc., Petitioner,
118. vs.
E. M. Matthews, Administratrix etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. F. L. Willcox for the petitioner, continued by Mr. R. E. Whiting for the respondent, and by Mr. Thomas W. Davis for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Oscar R. Houston, It is ordered that John R. Van Horne, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Victor C. Cormier, It is ordered that William Hollinger, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick P. Fish, It is ordered that John J. McCarthy, Esquire, of Salem, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry L. Underwood, It is ordered that Hyrum S. Cartwright, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. Warner Parker, It is ordered that Albert Thurston St. Clair, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis L. Brinkman, It is ordered that Hector A. Bromllet, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Barry Mohun, It is ordered that Eugene De Bogory, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

James C. Davis, as Agent etc.,
Petitioner,
118. vs.
E. M. Matthews, Administratrix etc.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Thomas W. Davis for the petitioner.

Thomson Spot Welder Company,
Petitioner,
120. vs.
Ford Motor Company.

Three hours were allowed for the argument of this cause.
This cause was argued by Mr. Frederick P. Fish for the petitioner, and by Mr. Melville Church for the respondent.

Thomas M. Brady, Appellant,
121. vs.
Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior.

Upon the suggestion of death of Thomas M. Brady, and on motion of Mr. S. M. Stockslager for the appellant, leave was granted to file a substitution for the party appellant herein within twenty days. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. S. M. Stockslager for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harold G. Simpson, It is ordered that Albert C. Remele, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter Scott Penfield, It is ordered that Clarence C. Osborn, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otto A.Schlobohm,. It is ordered that Avel B. Silverman, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arch A. Young, It is ordered that Saul Praeger, Esquire, of Cumberland, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter Scott Penfield, It is ordered that M. Hubert O'Brien, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arch A. Young, It is ordered that W. Carl Richards, Esquire, of Cumberland, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hoke Smith, It is ordered that Arthur M. Loeb, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
684. vs.
James Rolph Company et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William R. Harr in behalf of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

Thomas N. Brady, Appellant,
121. vs.
Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. S. M. Stockslager for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

The Queen Insurance Company of America, Petitioner,
116. vs.
Globe & Rutgers Fire Insurance Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Oscar R. Houston for the petitioner, and by Mr. Van Vechten Veeder for the respondent.

Federal Trade Commission et al., Appellants,
250. vs.
Claire Furnace Company et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellants, and by Mr. Paul D. Cravath for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles M. Robb, It is ordered that Clarence W. Dealtry, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David A. Reed, It is ordered that Maynard Teall, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John C. Myers, It is ordered that Carl Sherman, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York; and John J. O'Connor, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry M. Foote, It is ordered that Quincy A. Gates, Esquire, of Wilkes Barre, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward E. Denison, It is ordered that Judson E. Harriss, Esquire, of DuQuoin, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins, It is ordered that William F. Ashley, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, It is ordered that Henry A. Jacobs, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Avel B. Silverman, It is ordered that Samuel M. Katz, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Avel B. Silverman, It is ordered that Louis Tyroler, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward G. Griffin, It is ordered that John Hugh Lally, Esquire, of Evanston, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Louisiana Public Service Commission et al., Appellants,

421. vs.

Morgan's Louisiana & Texas Railroad & Steamship Company.

On motion of Mr. H. Garland Dupre in behalf of Mr. Ivy G. Kittredge for The City of New Orleans, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae; and leave to participate in the oral argument was denied.

William Henry Packard, Appellant,
126. vs.
Joab H. Banton, District Attorney etc.

On motion of Mr. Louis Tyroler for The Association of Allied Taxi Owners, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company et al., Appellants,
489. vs.
The United States et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George T. Farrell in behalf of counsel.

Panama Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
369. vs.
Andrew Johnson.

This cause was argued by Mr. Richard Reid Rogers for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Wade H. Ellis for the defendant in error.

Helen C. Frick, Plaintiff in Error,
442. vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
Helen C. Frick, Plaintiff in Error,
443. vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
Adelaide H. C. Frick et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
444. vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
Adelaide H. C. Frick et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
445. vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. George Wharton Pepper for the plaintiffs in error, continued by Mr. David A. Reed for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. George B. Gordon for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that William J. Hughes, Jr., Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; Thomas A. Nicholas, Esquire, of Sundance, State of Wyoming; and John J. Darby, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Cassius C. Dowell, It is ordered that Gray Anderson, Esquire, of Knoxville, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward S. Brashears, It is ordered that Merton A. Albee, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. T. Stokely, It is ordered that Thornton Hardie, Esquire, of El Paso, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Clifford L. Hilton, It is ordered that John Fletcher, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Herman L. Ekern, It is ordered that H. G. Pickering, Esquire, of Superior, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duane E. Fox, It is ordered that Alexis C. Angell, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duane E. Fox, It is ordered that John C. Hewitt, Esquire, of Bay City, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nelson J. Jewett, It is ordered that Oliver J. Cook, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

R. H. Arnold, doing business as R. H. Arnold Company, and Globe Indemnity Company,
Plaintiffs in Error,

31. vs.

The United States of America for the use of W. B. Guimarin & Company.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Cudahy Packing Company of Nebraska,
Plaintiff in Error,
107. vs.
Mary Ann Parramore, as Widow and Guardian etc., et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Utah.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Utah, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the Courts of the State of Utah.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice McKenna,
Mr. Justice McReynolds,
Mr. Justice Butler.

Dora E. Rooker and William V. Rooker, Appellants,
295. vs.
Fidelity Trust Company, Triangle Realty Company, and Thomas West.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Indiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Indiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Domingo Diaz A. et al., Appellants,
113. vs.
Guillermo Patterson.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with

costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Canal Zone.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

National Association of Window Glass Manufacturers, National Window Glass Workers, et al.,
Appellants,
353. vs.
The United States of America.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions to dismiss the petition.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Ex parte In the matter of The United States of America, as Owner of Nineteen Barges, etc.,
23.
Original. Petitioner.

This cause came on to be heard on the petition for a writ of mandamus and/or a writ of prohibition, and the return to the rule to show cause, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that said rule to show cause be, and the same is hereby, discharged, and that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

J. Harrod Lehmann,
Plaintiff in Error,
170. vs.
State Board of Public Accountancy et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The State of North Dakota,
Complainant,
10, Original. vs.
The State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard upon the pleadings and proofs, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the bill of complaint in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, without prejudice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

The United States of America et al., Appellants,
456. vs.
Abilene & Southern Railway Company et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 25th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Home Telephone & Telegraph Company of Spokane, Appellant,
539. vs.
E. V. Kuykendall, as Director of Public Works of Washington, et al., etc., et al.

The Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Company, Appellant,
540. vs.
E. V. Kuykendall, as Director of Public Works of Washington, et al., etc., et al.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the motion to advance these cases be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the application for writs of certiorari on the merits is made.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California et al., Plaintiffs in Error,

684. vs.

James Rolph Company et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for hearing with No. 366, heretofore assigned for Monday, January 7th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company et al., Appellants,

489. vs.

The United States of America et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 21st next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles S. Bohler, Tax Collector of Richmond County, Georgia, et al., Appellants,

551. vs.

E. H. Callaway, as Executor of the Estate of J. B. White, deceased.

E. H. Callaway, as Executor of the Estate of J. B. White, deceased, Appellant,

552. vs.

Charles S. Bohler, Tax Collector of Richmond County, Georgia, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Charles S. Bohler, Tax Collector of Richmond County, Georgia, et al., Appellants,

551. vs.

E. H. Callaway, as Executor of the Estate of J. B. White, deceased.

E. H. Callaway, as Executor of the Estate of J. B. White, deceased, Appellant,

552. vs.

Charles S. Bohler, Tax Collector of Richmond County, Georgia, et al.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss, to affirm, or to reverse, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
62. vs.
California Midway Oil Company et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Commonwealth of Australia et al.,
Petitioners,
623. vs.
John L. McLean, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Patterson-MacDonald Shipbuilding Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railway Company, Petitioner,
390. vs.
Eva Chinn and Henry Chinn.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Appellate Court of the State of Indiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court of the State of Indiana and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert Berryman, Petitioner, | On petition for writ of certiorari
629. vs. | to the United States Circuit Court
The United States of America. | of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jake Tuckerman, Petitioner, | On petition for writ of certiorari
630. vs. | to the United States Circuit Court
The United States of America. | of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joe Robilio et al., Petitioners, | On petition for writ of certiorari
631. vs. | to the United States Circuit Court
The United States of America. | of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Loftis Wilkes et al., Petitioners, | On petition for writ of certiorari
632. vs. | to the United States Circuit Court
The United States of America. | of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wabash Railway Company,
Petitioner,
649. vs.
Samuel T. Hoff.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. J. Finneran, Petitioner,
664. vs.
William J. Burton, Trustee etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Continental & Commercial Trust & Savings Bank,
Plaintiff in Error,
504. vs.
Wilhelmina Werner et al.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pata Salkovich, by Kosto Unkovich, Attorney in Fact,
Petitioner,
595. vs.
Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied, for failure to file the same within the time prescribed by the statute.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sperry Oil & Gas Company et al., Appellants,
164. vs.
Pearl Chisholm et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for The United States, leave was denied to make oral argument herein as amicus curiae.

The motion for leave to file a brief herein as amicus curiae was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for The United States.

Angel Figueroa, Petitioner,
203. vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein for failure to submit the same within the time prescribed by the rule was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the respondent.

Grover E. Clemmings,
Plaintiff in Error,
223. vs.
The United States.

The motion to transfer this cause to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, pursuant to the Act of Congress of September 14th, 1922, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the defendant in error.

Peterson Oil Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
343. vs.
Guy G. Frary, State Inspector etc.

The motion to affirm or advance in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clarence C. Caldwell for the defendant in error.

George Remus et al., Petitioners,
638. vs.
The United States of America.
George Remus et al., Petitioners,
639. vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. T. T. Ansberry in that behalf, leave was granted to file briefs herein as amicus curiae.

James B. Dillingham, as President, et al., etc., et al., Appellants,
690. vs.
George V. McLaughlin, as Superintendent of Banks of the State of New York, et al.

George V. McLaughlin, as Superintendent of Banks of the State of New York, et al., Appellants,
691. vs.
James B. Dillingham, as President, et al., etc., et al.

The joint motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. P. A. Lyon in that behalf.

Louisiana Public Service Commission et al., Appellants,
421. vs.
Morgan's Louisiana & Texas Railroad & Steamship Company.

On motion of Mr. H. Garland Dupre in that behalf, this cause was reassigned for argument on Monday, March 3d next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Ziang Sung Wan, Petitioner,
451. vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Frederic D. McKenney in that behalf, this cause was reassigned for argument on Monday, March 3d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

The Chastleton Corporation et al., Appellants,
467. vs.
A. Leftwich Sinclair et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. Gwynn Gardiner for the appellants.

The Oliver American Trading Company, Inc., Plaintiff in Error,
662. vs.
The Government of the United States of Mexico et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred Hayes for the plaintiff in error; and statement in behalf of the defendant in error, The Government of Mexico, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George F. Snyder in that behalf.

Thomas N. Brady, Appellant,
121. vs.
Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior.

On motion of Mr. S. M. Stockslager for the appellant, leave to file a supplemental brief herein was denied.

In the matter of Stuart Kohn,
No. ———. Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion of Stuart Kohn that his name be changed on the Roll of Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court to read "Stuart Kohn Brandon",

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George Remus et al., Petitioners,
638. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Elijah N. Zoline for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

George Remus et al., Petitioners,
639. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Elijah N. Zoline for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

The Austin Western Road Machinery Company, Petitioner,
653. vs.
Disc Grader & Plow Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William B. Kerkman and Mr. Dwight B. Cheever for the petitioner, and by Mr. Amasa C. Paul for the respondent.

Lawrence F. Connolly, Administrator etc., et al., Petitioners,
659. vs.
Robert H. Elder, Administrator etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles

Wesley M. Smith, Appellant,
637. vs.
W. P. McCullough et al.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Paul A. Ewert, Mr. James S. Davenport, and Mr. Will R. King for the appellees in support of the motion, and by Mr. A. Scott Thompson for the appellant in opposition thereto.

William Leather and Leon K. Lee,
Appellants,
172. vs.
Mark J. White.

This cause was argued by Mr. Oliver J. Cook for the appellants, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Ottinger for the appellee.

William Leather and Leon K. Leigh,
Appellants,
172. vs.
Mark J. White.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings on the ~~District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois~~ merits in consideration of the decree of the District Court of the United ~~for further proceedings.~~ States for the Northern District of Illinois dated and entered July 7th, 1921.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

B. I. Salinger, Jr., Appellant,
341 &
342. vs.
The United States of America and Victor Loisel, as United States Marshal, Eastern District of Louisiana.

On consideration of the petition this day filed herein by the above named appellant, and after hearing counsel for the appellant and counsel for the appellees at the Bar,

It is ordered that the record and proceedings in that certain cause now depending in the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, numbered 4,068, wherein B. I. Salinger, Jr., is appellant and The United States of America and Victor Loisel, as United States Marshal, are appellees, be certified to this Court for its consideration, re-

view and determination;

It is further ordered that all further proceedings by the said Circuit Court of Appeals in said cause, other than the announcement and delivery of an opinion by such Court in such cause, are hereby stayed;

And it is further ordered that the said appellant, B. I. Salinger, Jr., be admitted to bail pending the consideration and disposal of said cause by this Court, upon condition that he give a bond in the penal sum of Ten thousand dollars, with surety to be approved by the Clerk of this Court, and conditioned for his appearance and surrender pursuant to the ultimate order of this Court in such cause, and for his obedience to that order and to any intervening order in the cause which this Court may make;

And it is further ordered that the bond so given shall be in addition to and independent of any other bond or bonds which the said B. I. Salinger, Jr., may have given in other proceedings, and that the rights and remedies of the United States on the bond given hereunder shall be in addition to the rights and remedies which the United States may have on any other bond given by the said Salinger.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

B. I. Salinger, Jr., Appellant,
341 & 342. vs.
The United States of America and Victor Loisel, as United States Marshal, Eastern District of Louisiana.

These causes and the other cause between the same parties wherein a writ of certiorari has been this day granted are hereby specially assigned for hearing on January 14th, 1924, at the head of the call for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Wednesday, January 2, 1924, at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 2, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl E. Mapes, It is ordered that Joseph R. Gillard, Esquire, of Grand Rapids, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George F. Wells, It is ordered that Howard B. Henshey, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California; Emmett F. Byrne, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois; Frank M. Ludwick, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri; Harvey D. Taylor, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri; George E. Fink, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois; and Frank L. Fawcett, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl J. Skinner, It is ordered that George F. Skinner, Esquire, of Clinton, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that T. D. Maness, Esquire, of Concord, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. Warner Mazer, It is ordered that J. Hampton Hoge, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. June C. Smith, It is ordered that Stanley H. Schwartz, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter Nelles, It is ordered that Felix C. Benvenga, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. June C. Smith, It is ordered that Logan F. Hachman, Esquire, of Sparta, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Ex parte In the matter of The United States of America, as Owner of Nineteen Barges and Four Tow-boats, Petitioner.

No. 23, Original.

The motion for leave to file motion to set aside order denying writ of prohibition, and the petition for rehearing, herein, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner.

William R. Rodman, Marshal, United States Petitioner,

546. vs.

Roland R. Pothier.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner.

Walter L. Marr, Appellant,
686. vs.
The United States.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee.

The City of New York,
Plaintiff in Error,
711. vs.
James McEntee and the State Industrial Board.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward G. Griffin for the plaintiff in error.

Flo LaChapelle, as Administratrix of the Estate of Peter Foumakis, deceased,
Plaintiff in Error,
No.___. vs.
Union Pacific Coal Company.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. J. Walsh in that behalf.

Horace Van Deventer, Petitioner,
657. vs.
Wholesale Merchants' Warehouse Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward A. Harriman for the petitioner.

The City of Opelika, Appellant,
524. vs.
Opelika Sewer Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William M. Williams in behalf of counsel for the appellant.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., Appellants,
565. vs.
Consolidated Gas Company of New York et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry Hertzoff for the appellants.

The Brooklyn Heights Railroad Company, Petitioner,
710. vs.
Celia Ploxin, as Administratrix, etc., of Louis Ploxin, deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John L. Wells for the petitioner.

Ex parte In the matter of The Kansas City Southern Railway Company and Bethlehem Steel Products Company,
—, Original. Petitioners.

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus and/or a writ of prohibition herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage for the petitioners.

Brooks-Scanlon Corporation, Appellant,
367. vs.
The United States.

The United States, Appellant,
385. vs.
Brooks-Scanlon Corporation.

On motion of Mr. George A. King in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief as amicus curiae herein.

Central National Bank of Tulsa, Oklahoma, Plaintiff in Error,
165. vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Preston C. West for the plaintiff in error, It is ordered that this cause be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26.

Puget Sound Power & Light Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
138. vs.
The County of King et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Howard A. Hanson and Mr. Malcolm Douglas for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. James B. Howe, Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, Mr. Thomas J. L. Kennedy, Mr. Walter B. Beals, and Mr. Walter F. Meier for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California and Mrs. Jenny A. Denny, Petitioners,
681. vs.
Zurich General Accident & Liability Insurance Company, Limited.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court

by Mr. William R. Harr in behalf of Mr. Warren H. Pillsbury for the petitioners, and by Mr. Hampton Hoge for the respondent.

Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California and J. Hansen, Petitioners,
682. vs.
Alaska Packers' Association.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William R. Harr in behalf of Mr. Warren H. Pillsbury for the petitioners.

Brooks-Scanlon Corporation, Appellant,
367. vs.
The United States.

On motion of Mr. Vernon E. West in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

The Opalite Sign Company et al., Petitioners,
670. vs.
Flexlume Sign Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Russell Wiles, Mr. George A. Chritton, and Mr. William H. Dyrenforth for the petitioners, and by Mr. Edward Rector, Mr. William Navarre Cromwell, and Mr. Comfort S. Butler for the respondent.

The United States of America et al., Appellants,
469.. vs.
The New York Central Railroad Company.et al.

On motion of Mr. T. M. Bryant in behalf of Mr. Leon B. Lamfrom for the National Association of Men's Apparel Clubs, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

The United States ex rel. Pioneer Construction Company, Petitioner,
655. vs.
Madison County, Arkansas, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Claude Duty for the petitioner.

Perkins Glue Company, Petitioner,
671. vs.
Gould Manufacturing Company et al.

Perkins Glue Company, Petitioner,
672. vs.
Wisconsin Chair Company et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas Ewing and Mr. Gorham Crosby for the petitioner, and by Mr. James A. Watson for the respondents.

Wilen W. Easterday, otherwise known as W. Wilen Easterday, Petitioner,
673. vs.
The United States of America.

Wilen W. Easterday, otherwise known as W. Wilen Easterday, Petitioner,
674. vs.
The United States of America.

Wilen W. Easterday, otherwise known as W. Wilen Easterday, Petitioner,
675. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry S. Barger for the petitioner.

Loftis Wilkes, Petitioner,
694. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles M. Bryan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Primos Chemical Company, Petitioner,
696. vs.
Goldschmidt Thermit Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George W. Wickersham and Mr. Paul Synnestvedt for the petitioner, and by Mr. Livingston Gifford for the respondent.

Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, Inc., Petitioner,
700. vs.
International Magazine Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Albert P. Massey for the petitioner, and by Mr. William A. DeFord for the respondent.

G. S. Swanson and H. G. Swanson,
Plaintiffs in Error,
364. vs.
Jack Sarja.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. F. Lyons for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. George Francis Williams, Mr. Henry C. Clark, Mr. G. S. Swanson, and Mr. H. G. Swanson for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Lucy Tom, nee Bigpond, Johnson Bigpond, and James J. Mare,
Plaintiffs in Error,
246. vs.
C. C. Mills.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louisiana Public Service Commission et al.,
Appellants,
490. vs.
Shreveport Railways Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hamilton F. Kean et al.,
Petitioners,
687. vs.
National City Bank.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioners to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein has been

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel. Nicolai Menservich, Appellant,
148. vs.
Robert E. Tod, Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of New York.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Walter Nelles for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Wesley M. Smith, Appellant,
124. vs.
Walter T. Apple.

This cause was argued by Mr. John S. Dean for the appellant, and by Mr. Edward E. Sapp for the appellee.

William Henry Packard, Appellant,
126. vs.
Joab H. Banton, District Attorney etc.
Carl Sherman for the Attorney General of New York, and concluded by Mr. Felix C. Benvenga for Joab H. Banton, as District Attorney etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. A. B. Silverman for the appellant, continued by Mr.

Anthony Molinari, Plaintiff in Error,
127. vs.
The State of Maryland.
Peter Weisengoff, Plaintiff in Error,
480. vs.
The State of Maryland.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Clarence Lippel for the plaintiff in error in No. 127, and continued by Mr. Saul Praeger for the plaintiff in error in No. 480. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Times Square Auto Supply Company, Inc., Appellant,
129. vs.
Kansas City, Missouri, et al.
Winger for the appellant.

This cause was argued by Mr. John B. Pew and Mr. E. F. Halstead for the appellees, and submitted by Mr. Arthur Miller and Mr. Maurice H.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 3, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George P. Snyder, It is ordered that Jerome S. Hess, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York; and C. Jackson Kehlinger, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Ross Hull, It is ordered that Howard M. Bingaman, Esquire, of Harrisburg, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

ORDER. It is now here ordered by this Court that the bond of the Marshal, Frank K. Green, dated January 1, 1924, be, and the same is, this day approved and recorded.

Said bond is in the words and figures as follows, viz:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS: That Frank K. Green, of Washington, District of Columbia, as principal, and The Fidelity and Casualty Company of New York as surety, are held and firmly bound unto the United States in the penal sum of Twenty thousand ($20,000.00) dollars, lawful money of the United States, to be paid to the said United States, or their certain attorney, which payment well and truly to be made, we bind ourselves, our and each of our heirs, executors, administrators, and assigns, jointly and severally, firmly by these presents.

SEALED with our seals and dated this first day of January, 1924.

WHEREAS, the above bounden Frank K. Green, hath been appointed Marshal of the Supreme Court of the United States:

NOW, THEREFORE, the condition of the above obligation is such that if the said Frank K. Green shall faithfully discharge the duties of his said office, and shall well and faithfully keep, disburse, pay over and account for according to law, the moneys that may come into his hands as such Marshal

aforesaid, then this obligation to be void, otherwise to remain in full force and virtue in law.

WITNESSES:
Charles Taylor, Jr.
Jno C. Urquhart.

Frank K. Green, (SEAL).

THE FIDELITY AND CASUALTY COMPANY OF NEW YORK,
By Edgar K.Legg,Jr.,
Attorney. (SEAL).

#956909.

The within and foregoing bond is hereby approved as to form, the sufficiency of amount thereof and the sufficiency of the surety thereon.

(Signed) Wm. H. TAFT,
Chief Justice of the
United States.

Stefano Sanguinetti, Appellant,

130. vs.

The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Benjamin Carter for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

W. Fish Wilson, County Collector etc., et al., Appellants,

131. vs.

Illinois Southern Ry. Co. et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. June C. Smith for the appellants, and by Mr. George B. Gillespie for the appellees.

The United States of America ex rel. Catoni Tisi, alias Lista Cortina, Appellant,

132. vs.

Robert E. Tod, Commissioner of Immigration etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Walter Nelles for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Thomas A. Delaney, Petitioner,

354. vs.

The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. David V. Cahill for the petitioner, and by Mr. A.A.Wheat for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Jamell, It is ordered that Edward P. Sanborn, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter H. Newton, It is ordered that Josiah E. Brill, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Burton K. Wheeler, It is ordered that Samuel V. Stewart, Esquire, of Helena, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Kansas Natural Gas Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
133. vs.
The State of Kansas on the relation of A. B. Helm, Attorney for the Public Utility Commission of the State of Kansas.

The State of Kansas on the relation of Fred S. Jackson, Attorney for the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Kansas, etc., Appellant,
137. vs.
The Central Trust Company of New York

On motion of Mr. J. E. Benton in that behalf, It is ordered that this cause be passed, to be heard with No. 155 when No. 155 is reached.

The State of Arkansas on the relation of Jefferson Black,

Appellant,

136. vs.

Board of Directors of School District No. 16, of Montgomery County, Arkansas.

On motion of Mr. Stuart Lewis, counsel for the appellee, leave was granted to file a brief herein for the appellee within thirty days.

Margaret C. Lynch, Executrix of the Last Will and Testament of E. J. Lynch, Collector of Internal Revenue, deceased, Petitioner,

139. vs.

Tilden Produce Company.

On motion of Mr. S. W. Williams in that behalf, It is ordered that this cause be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26.

Francis Wrenn, Plaintiff in Error,

144. vs.

The State of Iowa.

This cause was submitted by Mr. T. M. Zink for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. B. J. Flick for the defendant in error.

Joab H. Banton, District Attorney of the County of New York,

Appellant,

147. vs.

Samuel Huskay et al., etc.

On motion of Mr. H. M. Welch in that behalf, It is ordered that this cause be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26.

Steamship "Gul Djemal", Her Engines, etc.,

Appellant,

83. vs.

Campbell & Stuart, Inc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William A. Purrington for the appellant, continued by Mr. Oscar R. Houston for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. John M. Woolsey for the appellant.

Hannah Canard Barnett et al.,

Appellants,

134. vs.

N. A. Kunkel et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Lewis C. Lawson for the appellants, and by Mr. Preston C. West for the appellees.

Eneas J. McCurdy, County Treasurer etc., et al.,

Appellants,

135. vs.

The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. S. W. Williams for the appellee, and submitted by Mr. Elmer E. Grinstead for the appellants.

The State of Arkansas on the relation of Jefferson Black,

Appellant,

136. vs.

Board of Directors of School District No. 16, of Montgomery County, Arkansas.

This cause was submitted by Mr. R. G. Davies for the appellant, with leave to file brief for the appellee within thirty days.

The Texas Transport & Terminal Company, Inc., Plaintiff in Error,

141. vs.

The City of New Orleans.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. George H. Terriberry for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, JANUARY 7, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. R. Prince, It is ordered that Harry H. Smith, Esquire, of Mobile, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Warren H. Pillsbury, It is ordered that John H. Dunbar, Esquire, of Olympia, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. Clarence Aiken, It is ordered that Sherman A. Murphy, Esquire, of Albany, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Bunn, It is ordered that Charles Bunn, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry W. Taft, It is ordered that Paxton Blair, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Angus A. McLaughlin, It is ordered that Willis G. Sears, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Prentiss, It is ordered that Erskine R. Myer, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas W. O'Brien, It is ordered that Everett Flint Damon, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. M. G. Wallace, It is ordered that Robert H. Dye, Esquire, of Fayetteville, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
102. vs.
Raymond Bros.-Clark Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with

costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Paul V. Lacoste, Joseph E. Mares, Henry P. Mirandona, et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
65. vs.
Department of Conservation of the State of Louisiana.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

C. B. Giles, John Janes, I. Fiegel, et al., Petitioners,
59. vs.
Henry Vette, Peter M. Zuncker, Theodore Regensteiner, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Corona Coal Company, Appellant,
42. vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by

this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The Baltimore and Ohio Southwestern Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

115. vs.

Lula Burtch, Administratrix of the Estate of Guerney O. Burtch, deceased.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, and Swift Lumber Company,

Appellants,

40. vs.

Illinois Central Railroad Company and Fernwood, Columbia & Gulf Railroad Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Wyoming Railway Company, Appellant,

38. vs.

The United States et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Wyoming.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record

from the District Court of the United States for the District of Wyoming, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Peoria and Pekin Union Railway Company, Appellant, vs. The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, and Minneapolis and St. Louis Railroad Company. 318.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Southern Power Company, Petitioner, vs. North Carolina Public Service Company, The City of Queensboro, and The City of High Point. 110.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Sven Haavik, Appellant,
128. vs.
Alaska Packers Association.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Arthur W. Ide, Charles Grant Caldwell, H. B. Loomis, et al.,
Appellants,
37. vs.
The United States of America.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Wyoming.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The Queen Insurance Company of America, Petitioner,
116. vs.
Globe & Rutgers Fire Insurance Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with

costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The People of the State of New York, Petitioner,

352. vs.

Louis Jersawit, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Ajax Dress Company, Inc.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the order of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed in part and reversed in part; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Bertha Marie Brady, Widow of Thomas N. Brady, deceased, Appellant,

121. vs.

Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, and William Spry, Commissioner of the General Land Office.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

McMillan Contracting Company et al., Appellants,

167. vs.

Walter L. Abernathy et al.

McMillan Contracting Company et al., Appellants,

168. vs.

B. Maywood Hagerman.

McMillan Contracting Company and Fidelity National Bank & Trust Company of Kansas City,

Appellants,

167. vs.

Walter L. Abernathy and Carrie S. Abernathy.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri, transferred from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri, transferred from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

McMillan Contracting Company and Fidelity National Bank & Trust Company of Kansas City,

Appellants,

168. vs.

B. Haywood Hagerman.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri, transferred from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri, transferred from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Tidal Oil Company and Eleanor Arnold,

Plaintiffs in Error,

179. vs.

J. P. Flanagan.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby,

dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dayton-Goose Creek Railway Company,
Appellant,
330. vs.
The United States of America, The Interstate Commerce Commission, and Randolph Bryant, United States District Attorney for the Eastern District of Texas.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

Sperry Oil & Gas Company et al.,
Appellants,
164. vs.
Pearl Chisholm et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a brief of The United States as amicus curiae herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Grover E. Clemmings,
Plaintiff in Error,
223. vs.
The United States of America.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, transferred to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, pursuant to the Act of Congress of September 14, 1922.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James B. Dillingham, as President, et al., etc., Appellants,
690. vs.
George V. McLaughlin, as Superintendent of Banks of the State of New York, et al.

George V. McLaughlin, as Superintendent of Banks of the State of New York, et al., Appellants,
691. vs.
James B. Dillingham, as President, et al. etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance these causes, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the causes assigned for argument on Monday, March 10th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chastleton Corporation et al., Appellants,
467. vs.
A. Leftwich Sinclair et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Oliver American Trading Company, Inc., Plaintiff in Error,
662. vs.
The Government of the United States of Mexico et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 10th next, after the causes heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Angel Figueroa, Petitioner,
203. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the motion to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein under Rule 37,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Peter Son Oil Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
343. vs.
Guy C. Frary, State Inspector etc.

On consideration of the motion to affirm or advance in this cause,
It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on the summary docket on Monday, February 18th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wesley M. Smith, Appellant,
637. vs.
W. P. McCullough et al.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. E. Goodno, Plaintiff in Error,
256. vs.
South Florida Farms Company.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Florida, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Flo La Chapelle, as Administratrix etc., Plaintiff in Error,
No.——. vs.
Union Pacific Coal Company.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry Lewis, Petitioner,
No. ——. vs.
David Roberts, Jr., Trustee.

On consideration of the motion of Henry Lewis for an order allowing him to petition for a writ of certiorari in forma pauperis herein, without deposit for costs and without printed record,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of Kansas City Southern Railway Company et al.,
No. ____, Original. Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus and/or a writ of prohibition herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William R. Rodman, United States Marshal, Petitioner,
546. vs.
Roland R. Pothier.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,
It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 25th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Walter L. Marr, Appellant,
686. vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,
It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The City of New York,
Plaintiff in Error,
711. vs.
James McEntee et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,
It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause placed on the summary docket and assigned for hearing with Nos. 366 and 644, heretofore assigned for January 7th.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The City of Opelika, Appellant,

524. vs.

Opelika Sewer Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause placed on the summary docket and assigned for argument on Monday, April 7th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York et al., Appellants,

565. vs.

Consolidated Gas Company of New York et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause placed on the summary docket and assigned for argument on Monday, February 25th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

G. S. Swanson et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,

364. vs.

Jack Sarja.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Anthony Molinari,
Plaintiff in Error,
127. vs.
The State of Maryland.

Peter Weisengoff,
Plaintiff in Error,
480. vs.
The State of Maryland.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by

this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Times Square Auto Supply Company, Appellant,
129. vs.
Kansas City, Missouri, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction in that the bill of complaint did not show that the amount involved was in excess of $3,000.00.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, as Director General etc., Petitioner,
495. vs.
A. H. Manry.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Express Company, Petitioner,
500. vs.
Parke-Cramer Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George Remus et al., Petitioners,
638.& 639.vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writs of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Austin Western Road Machinery Company, Petitioner,
653. vs.
Disc Grader & Plow Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lawrence F. Conolly, Administrator etc., et al., Petitioners,
659. vs.
Robert H. Kider, Administrator etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Board of Directors of Miller Levee District No. 2, Appellant,
634. vs.
Prairie Pipe Line Company.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States ex rel. Pioneer Construction Company, Petitioner,
655. vs.
Madison County, Arkansas, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Opalite Sign Company and Mid-city Electrical Service Company, Petitioners,
670. vs.
Flexlume Sign Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorarari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Perkins Glue Company, Petitioner,
671. vs.
Gould Manufacturing Company et al.

Perkins Glue Company, Petitioner,
672. vs.
Wisconsin Chair Company et al.

On petition for writs of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and

of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wilen W. Easterday, otherwise known as W. Wilen Easterday, Petitioner,
673.
674. vs.
675.
The United States of America.

On petition for writs of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Loftis Wilkes, Petitioner,
694. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Primos Chemical Company, Petitioner,
696. vs.
Goldschmidt Thermit Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, Inc.,
Petitioner,
700. vs.
International Magazine Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Brooklyn Heights Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
710. vs.
Golde Ploxin, as Administratrix of the Goods, Chattels and Credits of Louis Ploxin, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fort Smith Light & Traction Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
646. vs.
Pagan Bourland et al., etc.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sallie Canard, Plaintiff in Error,
660. vs.
R. E. Snell, Jr., et al.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, as Agent etc.,
Petitioner,
118. vs.
E. M. Matthews, Administrator etc.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Agent etc.,
Petitioner,
326. vs.
John O'Hara.

The motion of the respondent for (1) quashal and dismissal; (2) suggestion of diminution of record and motion for writ of certiorari, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. A. McLaughlin for the respondent.

Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
684. vs.
James Rolph Company et al.

On motion of Mr. Warren H. Pillsbury in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
684. vs.
James Rolph Company et al.

On motion of Mr. Harvey D. Jacobin that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

The State of Washington,
Plaintiff in Error,
366. vs.
W. C. Dawson & Company.

On motion of Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

Nyanza Steamship Company, Appellant,
307. vs.
Jahncke Drydock No. 1 et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Forney Johnston in that behalf.

Prince Tyner, Plaintiff in Error,
697. vs.
Henry Buffington et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert M. Rainey and Mr. Streeter B. Flynn for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition.

Leila A. Cawthon, Administratrix etc., Petitioner,
701. vs;
Fred W. Fehr.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Murray Seasongood for the petitioner, and by Mr. Sidney C. Stricker for the respondent.

Molsie Bailey, Petitioner,
707. vs.
Claude Jones et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Guy H. Sigler for the petitioner.

Sam Michaelson et al., Petitioners,
708. vs.
The United States ex rel. Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Donald R. Richberg, Mr. John A. Cadigan, and Mr. Jackson H. Ralston for the petitioners, and by Mr. Richard L. Kennedy for the respondent.

Nicie Homer, Petitioner,
709. vs.
D. B. Lester et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Guy H. Sigler for the petitioner.

Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
715. vs.
J. Fred Drayton.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander Britton and Mr. Gardiner Lathrop for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition.

Yadkin Railroad Company et al., Petitioners,
718. vs.
Ada Sigmon, Administratrix etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. O'B. Cooper, Mr. S. R. Prince, Mr. B. S. Womble, and Mr. L. E. Jeffries for the petitioners, and by Mr. T. D. Maness for the respondent.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
726. vs.
O. T. Belshe.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Murray Allen for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition, and by Mr. Clyde A. Douglass, Mr. William C. Douglass, and Mr. Robert H. Simms for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company, Petitioner,
727. vs.
V. C. Pickering, Administrator etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sam P. Maddox for the petitioner, and by Mr. John D. Little, Mr. Arthur Gray Powell, Mr. Marion Smith, and Mr. Max F. Goldstein for the respondent.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, etc., Petitioner,
149. vs.
Samuel Wechsler.

On writ of certiorari to the Kansas City Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to reverse the judgment of the Kansas City Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri in this cause has been filed,

THEREFORE, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Kansas City Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Kansas City Court of Appeals for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company, Plaintiff in Error,
337. vs.
Mary L. Morrell.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Theodore Francis Green and Mr. Patrick P. Curran for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. George H. Huddy, Jr., Mr. E. Butler Moultcon, and Mr. Frank P. Mason for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
558. vs.
Gwenden Shaffer, by her Guardian etc.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Platt Hubbell for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. John E. Dolman, Mr. M. L. Bell, Mr. W. F. Dickinson, Mr. Bruce Scott, Mr. H. J. Nelson, and Mr. J. C. Trimble for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Hon. Edward E. Cushman, United States District Judge etc., Petitioner,
669. vs.
The Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Railroad and Warehouse Commission of the State of Minnesota et al., Appellants,
150. vs.
The Duluth Street Railway Company.

This cause was continued, per stipulation.

The Texas Transport & Terminal Company, Inc., Plaintiff in Error,
141. vs.
The City of New Orleans.
in error, and concluded by Mr. George H. Terriberry for the plaintiff in error.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. George H. Terriberry for the plaintiff in error, by Mr. W. Catesby Jones for the defendant

Ex parte In the matter of Transportes Maritimos do Estado, etc.,
No. 26, Orig'l. Petitioner.

The argument on the return to the rule to show cause was commenced by Mr. F. Dudley Kohler for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. E. Curtis House for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 8, 1924.-

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Bolitha J. Laws, It is ordered that Francis Price, Esquire, of Santa Barbara, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur I. Vorys, It is ordered that Edward L. Pease, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Melville D. Church, It is ordered that Dean S. Edmonds, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert G. Simmons, It is ordered that Julius D. Cronin, Esquire, of O'Neill, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Bird J.

Vincent, It is ordered that Seymour J. Frank, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter W. Stevens, It is ordered that Gifford H. Hale, Esquire, of Grand Island, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., It is ordered that Clayton A. McCleary, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nelson T. Hartson, It is ordered that Millard T. Hartson, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Borah, It is ordered that J. M. Lampert, Esquire, of Boise, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Ex parte In the matter of Transportes Maritimos do Estado, etc., No. 26, Original. Petitioner.

The argument on the return to the rule to show cause was continued by Mr. E. Curtis Rouse for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. F. Dudley Kohler for the petitioner. Leave was granted counsel for the petitioner to file exceptions to the return within one week.

Brooks-Scanlon Corporation, Appellant, 367. vs. The United States.

The United States, Appellant, 385. vs. Brooks-Scanlon Corporation.

This cause was argued by Mr. John Junell for the Brooks-Scanlon Corporation, and by Mr. Henry M. Ward for The United States.

The State of Washington,
Plaintiff in Error,
366. vs.
~~The United States~~ W.C.Dawson &Co.
Industrial Accident Commission
of the State of California et
al., Plaintiffs in Error,
684. vs.
James Rolph Company et al.
The City of New York,
Plaintiff in Error,
711. vs.
James M. McEntee et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. John H. Dunbar for the State of Washington, continued by Mr. Warren H. Pillsbury for the Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California et al., and by Mr. E. Clarence Aiken for James McEntee et al.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 9, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chester I. Long, It is ordered that W. E. Stanley, Esquire, of Wichita, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Isidor Enselman, It is ordered that Jay Arthur Gilman, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel D. Miller, It is ordered that Hugh W. McCulloch, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otto Schlobohm, It is ordered that Julian D. Dusenbury, Esquire, of Greenville, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merrill Moores, It is ordered that Samuel G. Newton, Esquire, of San Antonio, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merrill Moores, It is ordered that Henry M. Wurzbach, Esquire, of Seguin, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David P. Wolhaupter, It is ordered that Harry Frease, Esquire, of Canton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America et al., Appellants,
469. vs.
The New York Central Railroad Company.

On motion of Mr. Robert E. Quirk, counsel for the International Federation of Commercial Travelers Organization, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

The John E. Thropp's Sons Company, Petitioner,
185. vs.
Frank A. Seiberling.

On motion of Mr. Harry Frease in his own behalf, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

Nicie Homer, Petitioner,
709. vs.
D. B. Lester et al.

On motion of Mr. Alexander Britton, in behalf of counsel, leave was granted the respondent herein to file a brief on or before Monday next.

The State of Washington, Plaintiff in Error,
366. vs.
W. C. Dawson & Company.
Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California et al., Appellants,
684. vs.
James Rolph Company et al.
The City of New York, Plaintiff in Error,
711. vs.
James McEntee et al.

The argument of these cases was concluded by Mr. E. Clarence Aiken for James McEntee et al.; and cases submitted by Mr. R. S. Terhune and Mr. H. G. Cosgrove for the defendant in error in No. 366, by Mr. G. Bowdoin Craighill, Mr. L. A. Redman, and Mr.

Charles B. Tebbs for the defendants in error in No. 684, and by Mr. George P. Nicholson and Mr. John F. O'Brien for the plaintiff in error in No. 711.

R. E. Sheehan Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
593. vs.
George K. Shuler, as State Treasurer of the State of New York, et al.

New York State Railways,
Plaintiff in Error,
103. vs.
George K. Shuler, as State Treasurer of the State of New York, et al.

These cases were argued by Mr. S. A. Murphy for the plaintiff in error in No. 103, and by Mr. E. C. Aiken for the defendants in error.

The Banco Mexicana de Commercio e Industria et al., Appellants,
361. vs.
Deutsche Bank et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Henry W. Taft for the appellants, and by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Seymour for the appellees.

Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond,
Plaintiff in Error,
553. vs.
D. J. Malloy and J. H. Malloy, trading as Malloy Brothers.

This cause was argued by Mr. M. C. Wallace for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Robert H. Dye for the defendants in error.

The United States of America et al.,
Appellants,
469. vs.
The New York Central Railroad Company et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for The United States.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 10, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Wescott, It is ordered that Samuel B. Scott, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry W. Hill, It is ordered that Walter F. Hofheins, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Austin V. Cannon, It is ordered that Bert M. Kent, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, It is ordered that Louis L. Korn, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. P. P. Campbell, It is ordered that Phil H. Callery, Esquire, of Pittsburg, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel Rayburn, It is ordered that James D. Buster, Esquire, of Sherman, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alva B. Adams, It is ordered that Charles Roach, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado; and William R. Kelly, Esquire, of Greeley, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as ~~an~~ Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

William H. Edwards, formerly Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York, Petitioner,
276. vs.
Joseph Jermain Slocum et al.

On motion of Mr. Robert Thorne, in behalf of Executors of the Estate of Joseph R. DeLamar, deceased, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amici curiae.

The United States of America et al., Appellants,
469. vs.
The New York Central Railroad Company et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for The United States, by Mr. P.J. Farrell for the Interstate Commerce Commission, by Mr. Charles P. Choate, Jr., for the New York Central Railroad Company, and concluded by Mr. Hoke Smith for the National Council of Travelling Salesmen's Associations.

William H. Edwards, formerly Collector etc., Petitioner,
276. vs.
Joseph Jermain Slocum et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert Thorne for the respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 11, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. W. King, It is ordered that Leslie E. Salter, Esquire, of Carmen, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles P. Ford, It is ordered that O. Benjamin Jefferson, Esquire, of Muskogee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Young Men's Christian Association of Columbus, Ohio, et al., Petitioners,
249. vs.
Ora Davis et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. J. I. Boulger for the petitioners, and by Mr. Arthur I. Vorys for the respondents.

Pierce Oil Corporation, Appellant,
151. vs.
Luther Hopkins, County Clerk, et al. etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. Sam T. Poe for the appellant, and by Mr. William T. Hemmock for the appellees.

J. E. Raley & Brothers et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
152. vs.
W. S. Richardson, Tax Collector etc., et al.

This cause was submitted by Mr. John P. Ross and Mr. E. B. Weatherly for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. George M. Napier, Mr. T. R. Gress, and Mr. Frank Carter for the defendants in error.

Jose E. Benedicto, as Treasurer of Porto Rico, Appellant,
153. vs.
Porto Rican American Tobacco Company of Porto Rico.

The motion to substitute J. W. Bonner, present Treasurer of Porto Rico, as the party appellant herein, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Grant T. Trent for the appellant. This cause was argued by Mr. Grant T. Trent for the appellant, and by Mr. A. Lewis Brown for the appellee.

Warren Myers et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
158. vs.
The United States.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Allyn Smith for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. George Ross Hull for the defendants in error.

Electric Boat Company, Appellant,
159. vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Dean S. Edmonds for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, JANUARY 14, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George T. Farrell, It is ordered that Walter E. Barton, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry B. Martin, It is ordered that William L. Barnum, Esquire, of Phoenix, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that George H. Wilson, Esquire, of Quincy, State of Illinois; and Charles D. Driscoll, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Jacob A. Overlander, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George F. Short, It is ordered that David A. Stovall, Esquire, of Hugo, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Joseph A. Burdeau, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otto Schlobohm, It is ordered that Vicente Villamin, Esquire, of Lemery, Batangas, Philippine Islands, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins, It is ordered that Goldthwaite H. Dorr, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York; Albert W. Putnam, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York; and Edmund A. Hayes, Esquire, of New Brunswick, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Park Trammell, It is ordered that Rivers H. Buford, Esquire, of Tallahassee, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Park Trammell, It is ordered that Marvin Crosby McIntosh, Esquire, of Tallahassee, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Preston A. Shinn, It is ordered that L. A. Justus, Jr., Esquire, of Pawhuska, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clinton O. Bunn, It is ordered that Maurice F. Lord, Esquire, of Aurora, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick P. Fish, It is ordered that William H. Davis, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

W. Trinidad, as Insular Collector of Internal Revenue of the Philippine Islands, Petitioner,
53. vs.
Sagrada Orden de Predicadores de la Provincia del Santisimo Rosario de Filipinas.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

W. Fish Wilson, County Collector of Taxes for the County of Marion; Richard Farrell, County Collector of Taxes for the County of Clinton, et al.,

Appellants,
131. vs.

Illinois Southern Railway Company, William W. Wheeler, as Receiver etc., et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

James C. Davis, Agent etc.,
Petitioner,
326. vs.
John O'Hara.

On consideration of the motion to quash and dismiss herein, and of the motion for certiorari for diminution of the record,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion to quash and dismiss be, and the same is hereby, denied.

It is further ordered that the motion for certiorari for diminution of the record be, and the same is hereby, denied; with leave to the respondent, at his own expense, to present such certified parts of the record of the first trial as he deems necessary to show the waiver of the venue, costs for the same to be adjudged in the final judgment of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Myanza Steamship Company,
Appellant,
307. vs.
Jahncke Drydock No. 1 et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause placed on the summary docket and assigned for argument on Monday, March 3d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company, Plaintiff in Error,
337. vs.
Mary L. Morrell.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits; and the cause placed on the summary docket and assigned for argument on Monday, March 3d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
558. vs.
Gwenden Shaffer, by her Guardian etc.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The City of New York,
Plaintiff in Error,
711. vs.
James McEntee et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Francis Wrenn,
Plaintiff in Error,
144. vs.
The State of Iowa.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jose E. Benedicto, as Treasurer of Porto Rico,
Appellant,
153. vs.
Porto Rican American Tobacco Company of Porto Rico.

Appeal from the District Court of The United States for Porto Rico.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for Porto Rico, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause

be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions to dismiss.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sam Michaelson et al., Petitioners,
708. vs.
The United States, ex rel. Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Walter Davis, Petitioner,
534. vs.
John Barton Payne, Agent etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Leila A. Cawthon, Administratrix of the Estate of Kit Cawthon, deceased, Petitioner,
701. vs.
Fred W. Fehr.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
715. vs.
J. Fred Drayton.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
725. vs.
O. T. Belshe.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company, Petitioner,
727. vs.
V. C. Pickering, Administrator etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Walter D. Sweeney, Claimant and Owner of the Schooner "Grace and Ruby", Appellant,
174. vs.
The United States.
pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf, It is ordered that this case be passed, per stipulation, to be restored to the call

Federal Trade Commission,
Plaintiff in Error,
206. vs.
American Tobacco Company.

Federal Trade Commission,
Plaintiff in Error,
207. vs.
P. Lorillard Company, Inc.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf, It is ordered that these cases be passed, per stipulation, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26.

The United States, Complainant,
24, Orig'l. vs.
The State of Minnesota.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the complainant, leave was granted to file a reply brief to defendant's claims of offset.

Ex parte In the matter of Clarence H. Venner, (—, Orig'l.) Petitioner,

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Otto Schlobohm in behalf of Mr. Elijah N. Zoline for the petitioner, with leave to counsel for the respondent to file brief in opposition thereto.

The State of Missouri ex rel. The St. Louis, Brownsville & Mexico Railway Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
376. vs.
Wilson A. Taylor.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. E. Harriman in that behalf.

Chicago Great Western Railroad Company, Appellant,
192. vs.
Nathan E. Kendall, Governor etc., et al.

Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Appellant,
193. vs.
Nathan E. Kendall, Governor etc., et al.

These cases were continued, per stipulation.

George R. Meek, Petitioner,
590. vs.
Centre County Banking Company et al.

Florence F. Dale, Petitioner,
591. vs.
Centre County Banking Company et al.

Andrew Breeze, Petitioner,
592. vs.
Centre County Banking Company et al.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry Keller in that behalf.

The United States, Appellant,
217. vs.
Charles J. Ferris.

On motion of Mr. George A. King in behalf of Morrison Shafroth, leave was granted to file a brief herein

The State of Georgia,
Complainant,
21, Orig'l. vs.
The City of Chattanooga.

On motion of Mr. Fitzgerald Hall in that behalf, leave was granted the defendant to file a supplemental brief herein.

The City of Jackson,
Plaintiff in Error,
459. vs.
Lamar Life Insurance Company.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Garner W. Green, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The City of Jackson,
Plaintiff in Error,
460. vs.
Mississippi Fire Insurance Company et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Garner W. Green, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John C. Walton, Petitioner,
712. vs.
The State of Oklahoma.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Impeachment of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Finis E. Riddle and Mr. Henry B. Martin for the petitioner, and by Mr. George F. Short and Mr. J. D. Lydick for the respondent.

Joseph Rini et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
258. vs.
The State of Louisiana.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. V. Coco and Mr. Paul A. Sompayrac for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. A. D. Henriques and Mr. George J. Gullota for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Drusilla Carr et al., Petitioners,
706. vs.
Charles H. Stebbins et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. G. Ballard, Mr. Henry Warrum, Mr. Edward W. Felt, and Mr. Frank P. Walsh for the petitioners.

Henry F. Mueller et al., Appellants,
741. vs.
Samuel W. Adler et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ephrim Caplan for the appellants in support of the petition.

Joab H. Banton, District Attorney etc., Appellant,
171. vs.
Edward M. Fuller and William F. McGee, etc., et al.

This cause was submitted by Mr. John Caldwell Myers for the appellant. No brief was filed for the appellees.

Electric Boat Company, Appellant,
159. vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Dean S. Edmonds for the appellant, by Mr. Harry E. Knight for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Frederick P. Fish for the appellant.

B. I. Salinger, Jr., Appellant,
341. vs.
Victor Loisel, United States Marshal.
B. I. Salinger, Jr., Appellant,
342. vs.
Victor Loisel, United States Marshal.
B. I. Salinger, Jr., Petitioner,
705. vs.
The United States of America et al.

On motion of Mr. B. I. Salinger for the appellant and petitioner, leave was granted to file an additional brief herein. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. B. I. Salinger for the appellant and petitioner, and continued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the appellee and respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. H. Langley, It is ordered that William Neff, Esquire, of Muskogee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry J. Gerrity, It is ordered that John F. Hughes, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Forney Johnston, It is ordered that Henry A. Jones, Esquire, of Tuscaloosa, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lee S. Overman, It is ordered that Walter Lee Johnson, Esquire, of Apex, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fritz G. Lanham, It is ordered that Henry G. Wills, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry N. Haynes, It is ordered that Lawrence R. Temple, Esquire, of Fort Collins, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. A. Jones, It is ordered that Albert T. Rogers, Jr., Esquire, of East Las Vegas, State of New Mexico, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry W. Hill, It is ordered that George K. Staples, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York; and Palmer Canfield, Esquire, of Kingston, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry R. Rathbone, It is ordered that Kemper K. Knapp, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Herbert Mahler et al., Appellants,
184. vs.
Howard Eby, Inspector in Charge etc.

On motion of Mr. Walter Nelles in that behalf, It is ordered that this case be passed until Monday, January 21st next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

B. I. Salinger, Jr., Appellant,
341. vs.
Victor Loisel, United States Marshal.
B. I. Salinger, Jr., Appellant,
342. vs.
Victor Loisel, United States Marshal.
B. I. Salinger, Jr., Appellant,
705. vs.
The United States et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the appellee and respondents, and concluded by Mr. B. I. Salinger for the appellant and petitioner.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 15, 1924 - CONTINUED.

The Standard Parts Company,
Petitioner,
160. vs.
William J. Beck.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Bert M. Kent for the petitioner, continued by Mr. George L. Wilkinson for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. A. V. Cannon for the petitioner.

August Dorchy, Plaintiff in Error,
163. vs.
The State of Kansas.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. John F. McCarron for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. John G. Egan for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 16, 1924.-

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin C. Dutton, It is ordered that Scott Sanders, Esquire, of Washington, D. C., be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lucian H. Cooke, It is ordered that Randolph Bias, Esquire, of Williamson, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Joab H. Banton, District Attorney etc., Appellant,
147. vs.
Samuel Ruskay et al., etc.

This cause was submitted by Mr. John Caldwell Myers for the appellant, and by Mr. Harry I. Garrity for the appellee.

August Dorchy, plaintiff in Error,
165. vs.
The State of Kansas.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. John G. Egan and Mr. Chester I. Long for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Phil H. Callery for the plaintiff in error.

Sperry Oil & Gas Company et al., Appellants, vs. Pearl Chisholm et al. 164.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Preston C. West for the appellants, continued by Mr. H. L. Underwood for The United States (by special leave), and concluded by Mr. J. H. Langley for the appellee.

Albert B. Fall, Secretary of the Interior, Appellant, vs. The United States of America ex rel. W. G. Lynn, Guardian etc. 166.

On motion of Mr. C. Edward Wright in that behalf, Hubert Work, present Secretary of the Interior, was substituted as the party appellant herein. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. C. Edward Wright for the appellant, and continued by Mr. Conrad H. Syme for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 17, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William W. Arnold, It is ordered that Elmer C. Wesner, Esquire, of Robinson, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert B. Keenan, It is ordered that Charles B. McCrory, Esquire, of Okmulgee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Lyon, It is ordered that Henry S. Richmond, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. Darby, It is ordered that Robert Cushman, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James C. Peacock, It is ordered that John W. Townsend, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, Appellant, 166. vs. The United States of America ex rel. W. G. Lynn, Guardian etc. — The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Conrad H. Syme for the appellee.

The New York Central Railroad Company, 169. vs. The United States. — This cause was argued by Mr. S. H. West for the New York Central Railroad Company, and by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for The United States.

The United States ex rel. Melida A. Durnford, Plaintiff in Error, 173. vs. Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior. — This cause was argued by Mr. Samuel Herrick for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. H. L. Underwood for the defendant in error.

Robert J. Fleming et al., Plaintiffs in Error, 175. vs. Anna B. Fleming. — This cause was argued by Mr. B. I. Salinger for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. J. M. Parsons for the defendant in error, with leave to Mr. B. I. Salinger to file a supplemental brief for the plaintiffs in error.

Joseph Radice, Plaintiff in Error, 176. vs. The People of the State of New York. — The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Henry W. Hill for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 18, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Potter, It is ordered that Alfred Burger, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Irving I. Goldsmith, It is ordered that Herman B. Forman, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Potter, It is ordered that Eugene L. Greenewald, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edmund H. Parry, It is ordered that Edward C. Taylor, Esquire, of Longmeadow, State of Massachusetts; Franklin G. Neal, Esquire, of Springfield, State of Massachusetts; and Luther E. Morrison, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court,

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. J. Walsh, It is ordered that Loy J. Molumby, Esquire, of Great Falls, State of Montana; and Max P. Kuhr, Esquire, of Havre, State of Montana,be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. Harris, It is ordered that Alvan B. Rowe, Esquire, of Savannah, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Stitt, It is ordered that Samuel Tullman, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Donovan, It is ordered that Elkan Turk, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. M. M. Neely, It is ordered that Terence D. Stewart, Esquire, of Morgantown, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Northern Pacific Railway Company,
Appellant,
189. vs.
The United States.

On motion of Mr. F. W. Clements in that behalf, It is ordered that this case be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26.

Thomas N. Brady, Appellant,
121. vs.
Albert B. Fall, Secretary of the Interior.

Upon suggestion of the death of Thomas N. Brady, it was ordered that Bertha Marie Brady, widow of Thomas N. Brady, deceased, be substituted, nunc pro tunc as of January 7, 1924, as the party appellant herein, on motion of Mr. S. M. Stockslager for the appellant.

Joseph Radice, Plaintiff in Error,

176. vs.

The People of the State of New York.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Henry W. Hill for the plaintiff in error, by Mr. Walter I. Hofheins and Mr. Irving I. Goldsmith for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Henry W. Hill for the plaintiff in error.

The United States of America,
Appellant,

177. vs.

E. W. Gray et al.

The United States, Plaintiff in Error,

178. vs.

J. P. Ransom.

This cause was argued by Mr. S. W. Williams for the appellant and plaintiff in error, and by Mr. C. W. King for the appellee and defendant in error.

First National Bank of Greeley,
Plaintiff in Error,

180. vs.

The Board of County Commissioners of the County of Weld.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Harry E. Haynes for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elkan Turk, It is ordered that Harry G. Liese, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Andrew J. Hickey, It is ordered that Hawley O. Burke, Esquire, of Elkhart, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Farrell, It is ordered that Ralph Merriam, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Luther M. Walter, It is ordered that Nuel D. Belnap, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Lyon, It is ordered that Henry S. MacKay, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. R. Turney, It is ordered that A. H. Kirkaddon, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri; and Burnita Shelton Matthews, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. R. Serven, It is ordered that Alfred C. J. Farrel, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sidney C. Roach, It is ordered that Barney Reed, Esquire, of Linn Creek, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otis Wingo, It is ordered that Oscar A. Featherston, Esquire, of Murfreesboro, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America, The Inter-State Commerce Commission, National Council of Traveling Salesmen's Associations, et al., Appellants,		Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.
469.	vs.	
The New York Central Railroad Company, Atlantic City Railroad Company, Atlantic & St. Lawrence Railroad Company, et al.		

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this

cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Thomas A. Delaney, Petitioner,
354. vs.
The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Wisconsin.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The Banco Mexicano de Commercio e Industria and Elias S. A. de Lima, Francisco de P. Cardona, et al., Appellants,
361. vs.
Deutsche Bank, Thomas W. Miller, Alien Property Custodian, and Frank White, Treasurer of the United States.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The State of North Dakota, Complainant,
10, Original. vs.
The State of Minnesota.

It is ordered by this Court that the costs incurred in this cause be, and the same are hereby, taxed against the complainant.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of Clarence H. Venner,

——, Original. Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Walter Carr, Appellant,

555. vs.

A. Alexsen, Master etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Missouri ex rel. The St. Louis, Brownsville & Mexico Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,

376. vs.

Wilson A. Taylor, Judge etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George R. Meek, Petitioner,
590. vs.
Centre County Banking Company et al., etc.

Florence F. Dale, Petitioner,
591. vs.
Centre County Banking Company et al., etc.

Andrew Breeze, Petitioner,
592. vs.
Centre County Banking Company et al., etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and the cases placed on the summary docket and assigned for argument as one case on Monday, March 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hans Heidner and the National Surety Company, Petitioner,

613. vs.

St. Paul & Tacoma Lumber Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and of the argument of

counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Drusilla Carr et al., Petitioners,
706. vs.
Charles H. Stebbins et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John C. Walton, Petitioner,
712. vs.
The State of Oklahoma, by the Board of Managers of the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Impeachment of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Impeachment of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry F. Mueller et al., Appellants,
741. vs.
Samuel W. Adler et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph Rini et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
258. vs.
The State of Louisiana.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
177. vs.
E. W. Gray et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for want of jurisdiction. ~~amount required by section 241, Judicial Code.~~

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joab H. Banton, District Attorney etc., Appellant,
171. vs.
Edward M. Fuller et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court to be dealt with in the legal discretion of the Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joab H. Banton, District Attorney etc., Appellant,
147. vs.
Samuel Ruskay et al., etc.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court to be dealt with in the legal discretion of the Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States ex rel. Melida A. Durnford, Plaintiff in Error,
173. vs.
Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error,
178. vs.
J. P. Ransom.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this

cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in Error,
178. vs.
J. P. Ransom.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

ORDER. The Court will take a recess from Monday, January 28th, to Monday, February 18th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of New Jersey,
Complainant,
27, Original. vs.
Harry M. Daugherty, Attorney General, et al.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the defendants; with leave to counsel for the complainant to file a reply on or before February 18th next.

Edward and John Burke (Ltd.),
Appellant,
245. vs.
David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee, these cases were consolidated, to be heard with Nos. 200 and 95.

Ex parte In the matter of Skinner & Eddy Corporation, Original. Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus and/or prohibition herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Livingston B. Stedman and Mr. Louis Titus for the petitioner, with leave to Mr. Henry M. Ward to file a brief on behalf of the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, in opposition thereto, on or before Thursday next.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,
717. vs.
Sloss-Sheffield Steel & Iron Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. Perry Thomas and Mr. Charles J. Rixey for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition.

Edward and John Burke, Limited, Appellant,
245. vs.
David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, et al.

The motion to substitute Palmer Canfield, Federal Prohibition Director for the State of New York, successor to E. C. Yellowley, as a party appellee in this cause, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. F. Taliaferro, Mr. Samuel W. Moore, and Mr. Marcus L. Bell for the appellant.

The State of Michigan, Complainant,
25, Original. vs.
The State of Wisconsin.

The motion and stipulation to extend the time for defendant to answer until March 1st next was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Herman L. Ekern in that behalf.

E. I. Dupont de Nemours & Company. Petitioner,
517. vs.
James C. Davis, Director General etc.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George T. Farrell in that behalf.

Western Union Telegraph Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State of Georgia, as Owner of the Western & Atlantic Rail-

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis Raymond Stark, Mr. Arthur Heyman, and Mr. William L. Clay for the plaintiff in

error in support of the petition, and by Mr. Fitzgerald Hall, Mr. Henry C. Peeples, and Mr. Hooper Alexander for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

Westmoreland Brewing Company, Inc., et al., Petitioners, 713. vs. The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted by Mr. B. B. McGinnis and Mr. John Duggan, Jr., for the petitioners; with leave to counsel for the respondent to file a brief in opposition thereto on or before Thursday next.

M. M. Hopkins, Trustee etc., Petitioner, 719. vs. Equitable Trust Company. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick T. Saussy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Max Isaac for the respondent.

Matthew M. Hopkins, Trustee etc., Petitioner, 720. vs. National Shawmut Bank of Boston et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick T. Saussy for the petitioner, and by Mr. William L. Clay for the respondents.

Pyrene Manufacturing Company, Petitioner, 723. vs. Harrison H. Boyce et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. P. Warfield for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles Neave, Mr. Joseph H. Milans, and Mr. Edmund Quincy Moses for the respondents.

Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Ry. Company, Petitioner, The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court

mitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas D. O'Brien, Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage, Mr. Alexander E. Horn, and Mr. Edward S. Stringer for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederick M. Miner for the respondent.

Jay A. Heidbrink et al.,
Petitioners,
725. vs.
Elmer I. McKesson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. A. Whiteley for the petitioners, and by Mr. George E. Kirk for the respondent.

Joseley Tiger, Plaintiff in Error,
729. vs.
Aaron Drumright et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lewis C. Lawson for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition.

The First National Bank of Greeley,
Plaintiff in Error,
180. vs.
The Board of County Commissioners of the County of Weld.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Harry N. Haynes for the plaintiff in error, by Mr. William R. Kelly for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Charles Roach for the defendant in error.

Manufacturers' Land & Improvement Company, Plaintiff in Error,
181. vs.
United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Francis D. Weaver for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the defendant in error.

The Perkins-Campbell Company,
Appellant,
183. vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. George Ross Hull for the appellee, and submitted by Mr. Henry T. Hunt and Mr. Allen G. Swiger for the appellant.

The John E. Thropp's Sons Company,
Petitioner,

185. vs.

Frank A. Seiberling.

Three hours were allowed for the argument of this cause. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Livingston Gifford for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Park Trammell, It is ordered that Morey Dunn, Esquire, of West Palm Beach, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. Clint Cole, It is ordered that Charles V. King, Esquire, of Crestline, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Livingston Gifford, It is ordered that Barton B. Hutchinson, Esquire, of Trenton, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William F. Hall, It is ordered that Albert L. Ely, Esquire, of Akron, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lucian H. Cooke, It is ordered that Lucian H. Cooke, Jr., Esquire, of Roanoke, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. O. Stanley, It is ordered that John C. Worsham, Esquire, of Henderson, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jeremiah E. O'Connell, It is ordered that Henry C. Hart, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

John E. Thropp's Sons Company,
Petitioner,
185. vs.
Frank A. Seiberling.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Livingston Gifford for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. Melville Church for the respondent.

Norfolk & Western Railway Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
187. vs.
The Public Service Commission of West Virginia et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. John H. Holt for the plaintiff in error, and submitted by Mr. Randolph Bias for the defendant in error John Followay.

Taubel-Scott-Kitzmiller Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
188. vs.
David J. Fox et al., Trustees etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Elkan Turk for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 23, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. Calder Mackay, It is ordered that Daniel Alexander, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Prestonettes, Inc.,
Petitioner,
197. vs.
Francois Joseph de Spoturno Coty.

On motion of Mr. Frederic D. McKenney in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief as amici curiae herein.

Charlotte Anita Whitney,
Plaintiff in Error,
375. vs.
The People of the State of California.

On motion of Mr. Walter Nolles in that behalf, It is ordered that this cause be continued, per stipulation.

Taubel-Scott-Kitzmiller Company,
Inc.,
Petitioner,
188. vs.
David J. Fox et al., Trustees etc.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Elkan Turk for the petitioner, by Mr. David W. Kahn for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Elkan Turk for the petitioner.

W. H. Hoffman et al., Appellants,

190. vs.

Peter McClelland, Jr., et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Tom Connolly for the appellants, and by Mr. Joseph Manson McCormick for the appellees.

The United States of America ex rel. St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company,

Plaintiff in Error,

398. vs.

Interstate Commerce Commission et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. J. R. Turney for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. P. J. Farrell for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert E. Lee Sanor, It is ordered that M. Pearl McCall, of Washington, District of Columbia; and Earle B. Mayfield, Esquire, of Austin, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clinton O. Bunn, It is ordered that Jose Tous Soto, Esquire, of Ponce, Porto Rico; and Enrique Gonzalez Mena, Esquire, of Aguadilla, Porto Rico, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William A. Oldfield, It is ordered that J. K. Mahony, Esquire, of El Dorado, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Ross Hull, It is ordered that William I. Swoope, Esquire, of Clearfield, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Southeastern Express Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
201. vs.
Stokes V. Robertson, State Revenue Agent etc.

The retirement of Stokes V. Robertson as State Revenue Agent of the State of Mississippi was suggested; and the appearance of W. J. Miller, successor as State Revenue Agent of the State of Mississippi, as the party defendant in error herein, was filed and entered, on motion of Mr. Sanders McDaniel in behalf of counsel.

The United States of America ex rel. St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
398. vs.
Interstate Commerce Commission et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. P. J. Farrell for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. J. R. Turney for the plaintiff in error.

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company et al., Appellants,
489. vs.
The United States et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Luther M. Walter for the appellants, continued by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for The United States, by Mr. P. J. Farrell for the Interstate Commerce Commission, by Mr. Ralph M. Shaw for the Chicago Junction Railway Company et al., and concluded by Mr. Luther M. Walter for the appellants.

Herbert Mahler et al., Appellants,
184. vs.
Howard Eby, Inspector in Charge etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Walter Nelles for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alex. T. Vogelsang, It is ordered that Allan Trumbull, Esquire, of Port Townsend, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alex. T. Vogelsang, It is ordered that William Gilmore Feely, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Herbert Mahler et al., Appellants,
184. vs.
Howard Eby, Inspector in Charge etc.

Argument continued by Mr. Walter Nelles for the appellants, and concluded by Mr. George Ross Hull for the appellee.

Margaret C. Lynch, Executrix etc., Petitioner,
139. vs.
Tilden Produce Company.

This cause was argued by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the petitioner, and by Mr. George W. Peterson for the respondent.

C. E. Bulloch et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
194. vs.
Dermott-Collins Road Improvement District et al.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Joe S. Harris for the plaintiff in error. No appearance was entered for the defendant in error.

The United States, Appellant,

195. vs.

Ebate Investment Company et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. S. W. Williams for the appellant, and by Mr. A. T. Rogers, Jr., for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E. Chamberlain, It is ordered that Mace Stewart, Jr., Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis C. Cramton, It is ordered that Bert V. Nunneley, Esquire, of Mt. Clemens, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Orlin H. Graves, Esquire, of Muskogee, State of Oklahoma; and Alexander A. McDonald, Esquire, of Hugo, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David A. Reed, It is ordered that Dennis F. Donovan, Esquire, of Duluth, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Preston A. Shinn, It is ordered that James M. Humphreys, Esquire, of Pawhuska, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clinton O. Bunn, It is ordered that Miguel Guerra-Mondragon, Esquire, of San Juan, Porto Rico; and Antonio R. Barcelo, Esquire, of San Juan, Porto Rico, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John E. Benton, It is ordered that Eugene M. Reed, Esquire, of Lincoln, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Paul Kelley, It is ordered that Frank E. Mullen, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York; and Frederick M. Dolan, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roberts Clay Milling, It is ordered that Emile Godchaux, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

First National Bank in St. Louis,

Plaintiff in Error,

252. vs.

The State of Missouri at the information of Jesse W. Barrett, Attorney General.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.
Dissenting: Mr.Chief Justice Taft.

Washington-Southern Navigation Company

108. vs.

Baltimore & Philadelphia Steamboat Company.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered in the negative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Electric Boat Company,

Appellant,

159. vs.

The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The United States of America,

Appellant,

331. vs.

New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange, Inc., New York Coffee and Sugar Association, Inc., T. S. B. Nielsen et al., etc.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

Ex parte In the matter of Skinner & Eddy Corporation,
—, Original. Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus and/or a writ of prohibition herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward and John Burke, Limited,
Appellant,
245. vs.
David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On consideration of the motion to substitute Palmer Canfield, Federal Prohibition Director for the State of New York, Successor to E. C. Yellowley, retired, as the party appellee herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Michigan,
Complainant,
25, Original. vs.
The State of Wisconsin.

On consideration of the motion to extend the time to file answer herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. I. Dupont de Nemours & Company,
Petitioner,
517. vs.
James C. Davis, Director General etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause placed on the summary docket and assigned for argument on Monday, March 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Western Union Telegraph Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
702. vs.
The State of Georgia, as Owner of the Western & Atlantic Railroad Company.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California et al.,
Petitioners,
682. vs.
Alaska Packers Association.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California et al.,
Petitioners,
681. vs.
Zurich General Accident and Liability Insurance Company, Limited.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Westmoreland Brewing Company, Inc., et al.,
Petitioners,
713. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of

the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

M. M. Hopkins, Trustee etc., Petitioner,
719. vs.
Equitable Trust Company of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Matthew M. Hopkins, Trustee etc., Petitioner,
720. vs.
National Shawmut Bank of Boston et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pyrene Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
723. vs.
Harrison H. Boyce et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner,
724. vs.
James B. Frye.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jay A. Heidbrink et al.,
Petitioners,
725. vs.
Elmer I. McKesson.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. H. Bulloch et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
194. vs.
Dermott-Collins Road Improvement District et al.

It is ordered by this Court that cause be shown by C. H. Bulloch, G. W. Lambert, Della Scott, et al., plaintiffs in error herein, before this Court, at the City of Washington, on Monday, March 3d next, why, on the statement contained in their brief, the above-entitled cause is not moot.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George Carroll et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
117. vs.
The United States.

It is ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, restored to the docket for reargument and assigned for argument on Monday, March 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Eli Bunch,
Plaintiff in Error,
33. vs.
J. B. Cole et al.

It is ordered by this Court that the judgment of reversal rendered herein on November 19th, 1923, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to show that the reversal is on the writ of error; and that the writ of certiorari granted on November 13th, 1922, is dismissed.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Appellant,
447. vs.
The Supplee-Biddle Hardware Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellant.

William R. Rodman, U. S. Marshal,
Petitioner,
546. vs.
Roland R. Pothier.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner, It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, March 10th next,

Piedmont Coal Company et al.,
Petitioners,
776. vs.
James Edgar Hustead et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David A. Reed for the petitioner, with leave to file printed records hereafter.

Sam Michaelson et al.,
Petitioners,
708. vs.
The United States ex rel. Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Railway Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston for the petitioners.

George Robinson, Petitioner,
732. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Abner H. Ferguson and Mr. John F. Dore for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor

Ex parte In the matter of Rotex Company.
——, Original. Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash in behalf of counsel for the petitioner.

C. B. Giles et al.,
Petitioners,
59. vs.
Henry Vette et al.

The mandate in this cause was granted, on motion of Mr. Spencer Gordon in that behalf.

Whitney-Central National Bank,
Petitioner,
766 & 767. vs.
The Bank of America.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Emile Godchaux, Mr. J. Blanc Monroe, and Mr. Roberts C. Milling for the petitioners, and by Mr. H. Generes Dufour and Mr. Henry Root Stern for the respondent.

First National Bank of Guthrie Center, Iowa, Plaintiff in Error,
722. vs.
L. B. Anderson, County Auditor of Guthrie County, Iowa, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. G. Gamble for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition, and by Mr. Ben J. Gibson and Mr. Maxwell J. O'Brien for the defendants in error in opposition thereto.

Clifford E. Black, Petitioner,
728. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted by Mr. J. W. Morrow for the petitioner.

Pennsylvania Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
733. vs.
Clark T. McDonald.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals, Third Appellate District, of the State of Ohio, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. H. Gocke for the petitioner, with leave to the respondent to file a brief herein within five days.

Pluto Oil & Gas Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
734. vs.
H. C. Miller.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry B. Martin and Mr. B. B. Blakeney for the plaintiffs in error in support of the petition, and by Mr. D. A. McDougal, Mr. L. O. Lytle, and Mr. W. V. Pryor for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

Wong Doo, Petitioner,
736. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston, Mr. George W. Hott, and Mr. William J. Dawley for the petitioner.

Bank of Italy, Petitioner,
737. vs.
Merchants' National Bank.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted by Mr. M. C. Elliott for the petitioner, and by Mr. Marion H. Fisher for the respondent.

A. Schrader's Son, Inc.,
Petitioner,
742. vs.
James Martin Corporation et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William A. Redding, Mr. Arthur C. Fraser, and Mr. Eugene V. Myers for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hugh C. Lord and Mr. William S. Pritchard for the respondents.

The United States of America ex rel.
Adolph Paleais, Petitioner,
743. vs.
Jesse D. Moore, U. S. Marshal etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph G. M. Browne and Mr. Barnett E. Kopelman for the petitioner.

John L. McLean, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Patterson-McDonald Shipbuilding Company,
Petitioner,
744. vs.
Commonwealth of Australia et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ira Bronson and Mr. H. B. Jones for the petitioner, and by Mr. Corwin S. Shank for the respondents.

J. E. Williams et al.,
Petitioners,
751. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George E. Wallace for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Seymour for the respondent.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, as Agent etc.,
Petitioner,
757. vs.
Timothy Donovan, as Owner of the Deck Scow "Mary Ethel", et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Evan Shelby, Mr. A. A. McLaughlin, and Mr. John E. Walker for the petitioner, and by Mr. George V. A. McClosky for the respondents.

John T. Smith, Petitioner,
771. vs.
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the District Court of Renville County, State of Minnesota, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Tom Davis, Mr. Ernest A. Michel, and Mr. Robert M. Haines for the petitioner, and by Mr. F. W. Root and Mr. O. W. Dynes for the respondent.

Thomas M. Blake, Appellant,
210. vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, February 18th, next, at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Harry Unger, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. M. C. Elliott, It is ordered that Giles J. Patterson, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. Granville Munson, It is ordered that Hollis L. Mason, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma; and William Humphrey Biddle, Esquire, of Leavenworth, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert Ottinger, It is ordered that Jerome C. Lewis, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James B. Howe, It is ordered that Edwin C. Ewing, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otto A. Schlobohm, It is ordered that Thomas F. Cullen, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, It is ordered that William A. Loftus, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Ellen S. Mussey, It is ordered that Frances Edgerton-Spooner, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Riordon, It is ordered that Albert G. McCaleb, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois; and Earl F. Pierce, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that James C. Nicholson, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio; and Lawrence C. Spieth, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert H. Lovett, It is ordered that Paul J. Otto, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of This Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harvey Given, It is ordered that Louis G. Taylor, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otis Wingo, It is ordered that E. L. Matlock, Esquire, of Van Buren, State of Arkansas; and J. Guthrie Sain, Esquire, of Nashville, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham, It is ordered that Adolph E. L. Johnson, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Willis G. Sears, It is ordered that Nelson C. Pratt, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. White, Jr., It is ordered that Thatcher J. Kemp, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California; Roland R. Riggs, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; and Munson H. Lane, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward H. Wason, It is ordered that William N. Rogers, Esquire, of Sanbornville, State of New Hampshire, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick W. Dallinger, It is ordered that Jasper N. Johnson, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts; and H. Ashley Bowen, Esquire, of Lynn, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of

this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Lawrence C. Spieth, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
195. vs.
State Investment Company and Edward B. Wheeler.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Mexico.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

The Perkins Campbell Company,
Appellant,
183. vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Richard M. Jones, Plaintiff in Error,
73. vs.
Union Guano Company, Incorporated.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record

from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The Salem Trust Company,
Petitioner,
74. vs.
Manufacturers' Finance Company et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

(Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Brandeis concur on the ground that the rights of the parties are governed by the law of Massachusetts).

Guaranty Title & Trust Corporation, Receiver of Vue de L'Eau Company, intervener,
Appellant,
109. vs.
The United States, appellee; Norfolk-Hampton Roads Company, intervening appellee.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed, with costs to be paid by the appellant to Norfolk-Hampton Roads Company, as well as interest on $33,000.00 since September 22, 1922, until funds are available for payment by The United

States of the balance of the judgment.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

William Henry Packard,
Appellant,
126. vs.
Joab H. Banton, as District Attorney in and for the County of New York, and Charles D. Newton, at Attorney General for the State of New York.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Stefano Sanguinetti,
Appellant,
130. vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The Texas Transport & Terminal Company, Inc., Plaintiff in Error,
141. vs.
The City of New Orleans.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and

the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Dissenting: Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Mr. Justice Brandeis,
Mr. Justice Holmes.

J. R. Raley & Brothers, H. S. Prater & Company, Theo. W. Martin, et al.,

Plaintiffs in Error,

152. vs.

W. S. Richardson, Tax Collector of Fulton County, and William A. Wright, Comptroller General for the State of Georgia.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond,

Plaintiff in Error,

553. vs.

D. J. Malloy and J. H. Malloy, trading as Malloy Brothers.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the Courts of the State of North Carolina; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of North Carolina.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Red Cross Line,
Petitioner,
112. vs.
Atlantic Fruit Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The United States of America ex rel.
Catoni Tisi, alias Lista Cortina,
Appellant,
132. vs.
Robert E. Tod, Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of New York.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The United States of America ex rel.
Nicolai Mensevich, Appellant,
148. vs.
Robert E. Tod, Commissioner of Immigration of the Port of New York.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Pierce Oil Corporation,

Appellant,

151. vs.

Luther Hopkins, County Clerk of Sebastian County, Arkansas; J. H. Chandler, County Treasurer etc., and Sam Wood, Prosecuting Attorney of Twelfth Judicial Circuit of Arkansas.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Arkansas.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Steamship "Gul Djemal", Her Engines, Boilers etc., Hussein Lutfi Bey, Master,

Appellant,

83. vs.

Campbell & Stuart, Inc.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar decrees bear in the Courts of the State of New York.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Concurring:

Mr. Justice Holmes.

Warren Myers and Bill Summers,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The United States of America.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

158.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Ex parte In the matter of Transportes Maritimos do Estado,
Original. Petitioner.

26.

This cause came on to be heard on the petition for a writ of prohibition or a writ of mandamus, and the return to the rule to show cause, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said rule to show cause be, and the same is hereby, discharged, and that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Railroad Commission of Texas et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
Eastern Texas Railroad Company, E. B. Perkins, F. W. Green, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas.

145.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The State of Texas,
Appellant,
146. vs.
Eastern Texas Railroad Company et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

William H. Edwards, Formerly Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York,
Petitioner,
276. vs.
Joseph Jermain Slocum, Herbert Jermain Slocum, Stephen L'Hommedieu Slocum, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the Courts of the State of New York; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

(Mr. Chief Justice Taft took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause).

The United States of America at the relation of The St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
398. vs.
Interstate Commerce Commission of the

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

(Mr. Justice Butler took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause).

The Standard Parts Company,
Petitioner,
160. vs.
William J. Peck.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Board of Trade of the City of Chicago, Armour Grain Company, George A. Hellman, et al.,
Petitioners,
90. vs.
E. H. Johnson, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Wilson F. Henderson.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and

decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hannah Canard Barnett and Tucker K. Barnett, Appellants,
134. vs.
W. A. Kunkel and The Prairie Oil & Gas Company.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Puget Sound Power & Light Company and The City of Seattle,
Plaintiffs in Error,
138. vs.
The County of King, Frank W. Hull, as Assessor of King County; Norman M. Wardall, as Auditor of King County, et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert J. Fleming, John A. Fleming, Stanhope Fleming, et al., etc., et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
175. vs.
Anna B. Fleming.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record

from the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Herbert Mahler, Joseph Oates, Petro Nigra, et al., Appellants,

184. vs.

Howard Eby, Inspector in Charge Immigration Service, U. S. Department of Labor, at Chicago, Illinois.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions not to discharge the petitioners until the Secretary of Labor shall have reasonable time in which to correct and perfect his finding on the evidence produced at the original hearing, if he finds it adequate, or to initiate another proceeding against them.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Young Men's Christian Association of Columbus, Ohio; Berea College, and The American Missionary Association, Petitioners,

249. vs.

Ora Davis et al.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

Ex parte In the matter of the Rotex Company,

—, Original. Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Appellant,

447. vs.

The Supplee-Biddle Hardware Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause placed on the summary docket and assigned for argument on Monday, April 7th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sam Michaelson et al.,

Petitioners,

708. vs.

The United States ex rel. Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Railway Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 7th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Yadkin Railroad Company et al.,

Petitioners,

718. vs.

Ada Sigmon, Administratrix etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit

to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Nicie Homer, Petitioner,
709. vs.
D. B. Lester et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Clifford E. Black,
Petitioner,
728. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George Robinson, Petitioner,
732. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pennsylvania Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
733. vs.
Clark T. McDonald.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals, Third Appellate District, of the State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals, Third Appellate District, of the State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Bank of Italy, Petitioner,
737. vs.
Merchants National Bank.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. Schrader's Sons, Inc.,
Petitioner,
742. vs.
James Martin Corporation et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel. Adolph Palcais, Petitioner,
743. vs.
Jesse D. Moore, U.S. Marshal etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein

to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John L. McLean, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Patterson-McDonald Shipbuilding Company,
Petitioner,
744. vs.
Commonwealth of Australia et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John T. Smith, Petitioner,
771. vs.
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the District Court of Renville County, State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the District Court of Renville County, State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Piedmont Coal Company et al.,
Petitioners,
776. vs.
James Edgar Hustead et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of

the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,
717. vs.
Sloss-Sheffield Steel & Iron Company.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

First National Bank of Guthrie Center, Iowa, Plaintiff in Error,
722. vs.
L. L. Anderson, County Auditor of Guthrie County, Iowa, et al.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pluto Oil & Gas Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
734. vs.
H. C. Miller.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wong Doo, Petitioner,
736. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit

to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

It is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, placed on the summary docket, and assigned for argument on Monday, April 7th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, as Agent etc., Petitioner,
vs.
Timothy Donovan, as Owner of the Deck Scow "Mary Ethel", et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

757.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

It is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, placed on the summary docket, and assigned for argument on Monday, April 7th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Arkansas on the relation of Jefferson Black, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Board of Directors of School District No. 16, of Montgomery County, Arkansas.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

136.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America et al., Appellants,
666. vs.
American Railway Express Company et al.

Southeastern Express Company, Appellant,
667. vs.
American Railway Express Company et al.

Southern Traffic League et al., Appellants,
668. vs.
American Railway Express Company et al.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Solicitor General Beck in behalf of Mr. that behalf.

The State of Missouri ex rel. The Burnes National Bank of St. Joseph, Plaintiff in Error,
762. vs.
A. B. Duncan, Judge of the Probate Court of Buchanan County, Missouri.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in behalf of counsel. The motion for leave to file a brief herein as amicus curiae was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for The United States.

I. Goto et al., Appellants,
463. vs.
John C. Lane, High Sheriff, etc.

The motion for leave to file a brief herein as amicus curiae was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for The United States.

Margaret C. Lynch, Executrix of the Last Will and Testament of E. J. Lynch, deceased,
Petitioner,
784. vs.
Alworth-Stephens Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner.

The United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, Petitioner,
787. vs.
The Chase National Bank of the City of New York et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Harlan F. Stone, Mr. Chauncey G. Parker, and Mr. Henry M. Ward for the petitioner.

Hygrade Provision Company, Inc., et al., Appellants,
403. vs.
Carl Sherman, Attorney General etc., et al.

Lewis & Fox Company, Appellant,
404. vs.
Carl Sherman, Attorney General etc., et al.

Harry Satz, Appellant,
405. vs.
Carl Sherman, Attorney General etc., et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis Ottenberg in that behalf.

L. Santiago Carmona et al., composing the Workmen's Relief Commission of Porto Rico, et al.,
Appellants,
264. vs.
American Railroad Company of Porto Rico.

The motion to transfer this cause to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. C. Munson for the appellants.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
15, Original. vs.
The State of Texas, defendant; The United States, intervener.

The motion that certain lands and funds be returned by the intervener was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. C. Lanham in behalf of counsel for Mrs. Lillie Morgan et al.; with leave to The United States to file brief in opposition thereto on or before Friday next.

The State of New Mexico, Complainant,
3, Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

The motion for leave to file a brief herein as amicus curiae was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. R. Prince in behalf of counsel; and in opposition thereto by Mr. Frank W. Clancy for The State of New Mexico and Mr. W. A. Keeling and Mr. W. W. Turney for The State of Texas.

The San Francisco and Portland Steamship Company, Plaintiff in Error,
122. vs.
A. J. Parrington.

James C. Davis, as Agent etc., Plaintiff in Error,
123. vs.
A. J. Parrington.

On motion of Mr. Simon Lyon in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

The Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Company, Appellant,
789. vs.
M. V. Kuykendall, as Director of Public Works of Washington, et al., etc., et al.

The Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Company, Appellant,
540. vs.
M. V. Kuykendall, as Director of Public Works of Washington, et al., etc., et al.

The motion to advance these causes was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank T. Post for the appellant.

The Home Telephone & Telegraph Company of Spokane, Appellant,
790. vs.
M. V. Kuykendall, as Director of Public Works of Washington, et al., etc., et al.

The Home Telephone & Telegraph Company of Spokane, Appellant,
539. vs.
M. V. Kuykendall, as Director of Public Works of Washington, et al., etc., et al.

The motion to advance these causes was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank T. Post for the appellant.

S. C. Sandefur
679. vs.
Canoe Creek Coal Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston for S. C. Sandefur.

Ex parte In the matter of DeForest Radio Telephone & Telegraph Company, ——, Original. Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. Leo Everett and Mr. Samuel E. Darby, Jr., for the petitioner.

J. C. Walton, Appellant,
689. vs.
The House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. H. Serven in that behalf.

Flo LaChapelle, as Administratrix of the Estate of Peter Foumakis, deceased,

Plaintiff in Error,

735. vs.

Union Pacific Coal Company.

The motion to place this cause on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. R. Serven in that behalf.

Flo LaChapelle, as Administratrix of the Estate of Peter Foumakis, deceased,

Plaintiff in Error,

735. vs.

Union Pacific Coal Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. R. Serven in behalf of Mr. John A. Shelton for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition, and by Mr. H. H. Loomis and Mr. John W. Lacey for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

David J. Sheehan, Petitioner,

760. vs.

Braddock Coal Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted by Mr. Jasper N. Johnson for the respondent.

Patrick J. Donovan, Petitioner,

746. vs.

Cunard Steamship Company, Limited.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Otto A. Schlobohm in behalf of Mr. Joseph A. Burdeau for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lucius H. Beers for the respondent.

The United States of America,

Petitioner,

559. vs.

Ninety-five Barrels, more or less, alleged Apple Cider Vinegar, et al.

The motion to take this cause from the summary docket and to reassign the same for hearing was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John G. White and Mr. Austin V. Cannon for the appellees; with consent thereto by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner.

Mountain States Power Company,
Petitioner,
731. vs.
A. L. Jordan Lumber Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. B. S. Grosscup, Mr. John H. Roemer, and Mr. R. M. Campbell for the petitioner, and by Mr. C. H. Foot for the respondent.

Wilson Clinton, an incompetent, by Edmond Hill, his next friend and guardian, et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
739. vs.
Gypsy Oil Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horace H. Hagan for the plaintiffs in error in support of the petition.

Steamer "Spokane", Her Engines etc., Spokane Steamship Company,
Petitioner,
748. vs.
Charles Steiner et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ray M. Stanley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Joseph A. Wechter for the respondents.

Will Avery, Petitioner,
749. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Randolph Cooper for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Fulton National Bank of Atlanta,
Petitioner,
750. vs.
I. S. Hoosier et al., Receivers of Imbrie Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John D. Little, Mr. Arthur G. Powell, Mr. Marion Smith, and Mr. Max F. Goldstein for the petitioner.

William Gillespie et al., doing business as Gillespie Bros. & Company, Petitioners,

754. vs.

J. Aron & Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George F. Canfield and Mr. Randolph Hicks for the petitioners, and by Mr. Cletus Keating, Mr. John M. Woolsey, and Mr. T. M. Hegembourg for the respondent.

Hollin Abell, Petitioner,

755. vs.

General Motors Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John L. Hall and Mr. Charles P. Curtis, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. John Thomas Smith for the respondent.

Arthur A. Kemp, Administrator etc., Petitioner,

756. vs.

Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Newcorn for the petitioner.

Thomas R. Wheeler, Petitioner,

758. vs.

The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Miel P. Sterne for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Wilbur L. Ball, Receiver of Haytian American Corporation, Petitioner,

759. vs.

Breed, Elliott & Harrison.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Markham Marshall and Mr. Louis B. Wehle for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry A. Wise and Mr. Cola G. Parker for the respondent.

Claude W. Johnson, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Kentucky Iron & Steel Company, Bankrupt,
Petitioner,
769. vs.
Louisville Trust Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David R. Castleman and Mr. Emile Steinfeld for the petitioner, and by Mr. Eugene R. Attkisson and Mr. Elliott K. Pennebaker for the respondent.

John E. Mathewson, Administrator of Rufus Overlander, deceased,
Petitioner,
770. vs.
Elizabeth Jane Richards.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jacob A. Overlander and Mr. Roger Foster for the petitioner.

George D. Proctor, Petitioner,
773. vs.
M. William Rossi et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph A. Seidman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Moses Cohen for the respondents.

Reading Company, Successor to Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company,
Petitioner,
777. vs.
Esther H. Fessler, as Administrator etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Clarke Mason for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank F. Davis for the respondent.

American Railway Express Company,
Petitioner,
778. vs.
The Commonwealth of Kentucky.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles W. Stockton for the petitioner.

Delia Holt, by her next friend, Delia Holt,

Petitioner,

779. vs.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Arnold for the petitioner.

The Safe-Cabinet Company,

Petitioner,

791. vs.

The Globe-Wernicke Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James L. Stewart for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert H. Parkinson and Mr. Wallace R. Lane for the respondent.

Louis Cohen, Petitioner,

801. vs.

The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward F. Colladay and Mr. Michael J. Heintz for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Henry Lewis, Petitioner,

807. vs.

Davis Roberts, Jr., as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Montevallo Mining Company, Bankrupt.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Claude D. Ritter for the petitioner.

Anglo-American Oil Company, Ltd.,

Petitioner,

814. vs.

R. J. Green, Claimant of the Steamship "G. R. Crowe", Her Engines, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. H. McGrann and Mr. John M. Woolsey for the petitioner, and by Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper and Mr. Charles C. Burlingham for the respondents.

L. H. Meyers, Sr., et al., Petitioners, vs. Charles H. Anderson et al., etc. 818.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John C. Bedell for the petitioners, and by Mr. Giles J. Patterson for the respondents.

Continental & Commercial Trust & Savings Bank, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Wilhelmina Werner et al. 504.

The motion to dismiss the writ of error and to deny the petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William W. Ray and Mr. M. F. Ryan for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Oliver O. Haga for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Tacoma Grain Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Northern Pacific Railway Company. 693.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles W. Bunn for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. John E. Belcher and Mr. Merritt J. Gordon for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Henry E. DeKay, Appellant, vs. William R. Rodman, U.S.Marshal, for the District of Rhode Island. 457.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Rhode Island.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Whitney-Central National Bank, Petitioner, vs. The Bank of America. 766. 767.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the petition for writs of certiorari in these cases has been filed,

THEREFORE, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
715. vs.
J. Fred Drayton.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel D. White, as Trustee of the Estate of Pete Stump, Bankrupt, Petitioner,
186. vs.
Veta Stump.

This cause was submitted by Mr. James E. Babb for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harve H. Phipps for the respondent.

Prestonettes, Inc., Petitioner,
197. vs.
Francois Joseph Spoturno Coty.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Charles H. Tuttle for the petitioner, continued by Mr. Asher Blum and Mr. Lindley M. Garrison for the respondent, and by Mr. Louis Marshall for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nelson T. Hartson, It is ordered that Ronald Higgins, Esquire, of Missoula, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter H. Newton, It is ordered that W. Bissell Thomas, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Franklin P. Shaw, It is ordered that Daniel E. Farr, Esquire, of Sioux City, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank T. Post, It is ordered that James A. Williams, Esquire, of Spokane, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nelson T. Hartson, It is ordered that Charles T. Donworth, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. A. Wheat, It is ordered that Jesse E. Highee, Esquire, of LaCrosse, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, It is ordered that George Ransom Wickham, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, It is ordered that Andrew Markhus, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank T. Post, It is ordered that Lawrence H. Brown, Esquire, of Spokane, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. A. Wheat, It is ordered that Edward L. Bush, Esquire, of Washington Court-House, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. A. Wheat, It is ordered that Frank A. Gaynor, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. B. Mathews, It is ordered that Jesse E. Stephens, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. B. Mathews, It is ordered that Lucius P. Green, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nelson T. Hartson, It is ordered that James Hart Willis, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Reed, It is ordered that Richard Wayne Ely, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles F. Carusi, It is ordered that William Boyd Spencer, Esquire, pf Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Prestonettes, Inc.,
Petitioner,
197. vs.
Francois Joseph de Spoturno Coty.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Louis Marshall for the petitioner.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,
198. vs.
Central Iron & Coal Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Homer W. Davis for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Henry A. Jones for the defendant in error.

Pacific Gas & Electric Company,
Appellant,
34. vs.
City and County of San Francisco.

Pacific Gas & Electric Company,
Appellant,
35. vs.
City and County of San Francisco
et al.

Pacific Gas & Electric Company,
Appellant,
36. vs.
City and County of San Francisco
et al.

This cause was reargued by Mr. Louis Titus for the appellant, and by Mr. Robert M. Searls for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leonidas C. Dyer, It is ordered that Edward J. McCullen, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, It is ordered that John Ballantyne, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edgar T. Brandenburg, It is ordered that Joseph F. Brandenburg, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Villard Martin, It is ordered that E. H. Moore, Esquire, of Okmulgee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

James C. Davis, as Agent etc.,
Petitioner,
114. vs.
The Portland Seed Company.

The San Francisco & Portland Seed Company, Plaintiff in Error,
122. vs.
A. J. Parrington.

James C. Davis, as Agent etc., Plaintiff in Error,
123. vs.
A. J. Parrington.

Great Northern Railway Company, Petitioner,
209. vs.
McCaull-Dinsmore Company.

Three hours were allowed for the argument of these cases, on motion of Mr. John F. Finerty in that behalf. The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. John F. Finerty for James C. Davis, Agent etc., continued by Mr. Arthur C. Spencer for the petitioner in No. 114 and the plaintiffs in error in Nos. 122 and 123; by Mr. F. G. Dorety for the petitioner in No. 209; and by Mr. James G. Wilson for the respondent in No. 114 and the defendant in error in Nos. 122 and 123; and concluded by Mr. John F. Finerty for James C. Davis, Agent etc.

C. J. Erickson et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
125. vs.
The United States et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Corwin S. Shank for the plaintiff in error, C. J. Erickson, continued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. Corwin S. Shank for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David A. Reed, It is ordered that George H. Rankin, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lucien H.Boggs,It is ordered that Monroe Curtis, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Isidor B. Dockweiler, It is ordered that Milton K. Young, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Freeman, It is ordered that Samuel Theodore Holmgren, Esquire, of Concord, State of New Hampshire, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James F. Ailshie, It is ordered that James R. Bothwell, Esquire, of Twin Falls, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James F. Ailshie, It is ordered that William H. Bonneville, Esquire, of Coeur d'Alene, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

ORDER. The Court will adjourn until Monday next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Swendig et al., Appellants,
142. vs.
The Washington Water Power Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. James F. Ailshie for the appellants, and by Mr. Frank T. Post for the appellee.

Fred P. Violette, Appellant,
143. vs.
James A. Walsh, Collector etc.

The resignation of James A. Walsh, as Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Montana, was suggested; and Charles A. Rasmusson, his successor as Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Montana, was ordered substituted as the party appellee herein, on motion of Mr. Joseph W. Cox in that behalf. This cause was submitted by Mr. Joseph W. Cox and Mr. C. A. Russell for the appellant, and by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt and Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee.

Ann S. O'Donnell, appellant,
161. vs.
Ned T. Powell, as Treasurer etc., et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Delphin M. Delmas for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Willard H. Stimson et al., Appellants,
162. vs.
The City of Los Angeles et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Delphin M. Delmas for the appellants, and continued by Mr. Jess E. Stephens for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John F. McCarron, It is ordered that Abraham Glovsky, Esquire, of Beverly, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter C. Clephane, It is ordered that Thomas C. Coffin, Esquire, of Pocatello, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry M. Ward, It is ordered that William W. Nottingham, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court by Mr. H. M. Evans, It is ordered by this Court that A. Hollingsworth, Esquire, of Keokuk, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Guy D. Goff, It is ordered that Harold A. Ritz, Esquire, of Charleston, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William S. Culbertson, It is ordered that Arthur W. Blackman, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elmer O. Leatherwood, It is ordered that F. J. Sullivan, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, , be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas J. Walsh, It is ordered that A. N. Whitlock, Esquire, of Missoula, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas J. Walsh, It is ordered that Llewellyn L. Callaway, Esquire, of Helena, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Clark, It is ordered that Elwyn Thomas, Esquire, of Fort Pierce, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter W. Magee, It is ordered that Henry W. Killeen, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. Bowdoin Craighill, It is ordered that John M. Murphy, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur B. Williams, It is ordered that Frank S. Weston, Esquire, of Kalamazoo, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles A. Christopherson, It is ordered that Blaine Simons, Esquire, of Sioux Falls, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Cassius C. Dowell, It is ordered that Leland S. Forrest, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. H. Fuller, It is ordered that Edward Allan Boyd, Esquire, of Wichita, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tilman B. Parks, It is ordered that Gus Ottenheimer, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jess E. Stephens, It is ordered that Walter K. Tuller, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Frank Staley, It is ordered that Edouard F. Henriques, Esquire, of New Orleans,

~~On motion first made to the Court~~

State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lucius Q. C. Lamar, It is ordered that L. Wethered Barroll, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James W. Beller, It is ordered that William R. Layne, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, It is ordered that Thomas H. Malone, Esquire, of Nashville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Washington,

Plaintiff in Error,

366. vs.

W. C. Dawson & Company.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes.
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California and Joseph Hayes, Thomas Hayes, et al., etc.,

Plaintiffs in Error,

684. vs.

James Rolph Company and General Accident, Fire and Life Assurance Corporation, Limited.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record

from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Dissenting: Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.
Mr. Justice Holmes,
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Matthew Addy Company, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

84.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Benjamin H. Ford, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

85.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Harry B. Stilz, Appellant,

830. vs.

The United States.

On consideration of the petition for leave to docket the above entitled case and proceed therein in forma pauperis,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

And it is further ordered that the record in this case be printed at public expense.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

L. Santiago Carmona et al., composing the Workmen's Relief Commission of Porto Rico, et al.,

Appellants,

264. vs.

American Railroad Company of Porto Rico.

On consideration of the motion to transfer this cause to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, pursuant to the Act of Congress of September 14, 1922 (42 Stat. 837).

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of New Mexico,

Complainant,

3, Original. vs.

The State of Texas.

On consideration of the motion of L. M. Crawford for leave to file a brief herein as amicus curiae and to take part in the oral argument,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the motion for leave to file a brief herein as amicus curiae be, and the same is hereby, granted; and that the motion for leave to take part in the oral argument be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of DeForrest Radio Telephone & Telegraph Company,

——, Original. Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Flo La Chapelle, as Administratrix of the Estate of Peter Poumakis, deceased,
Plaintiff in Error,
735. vs.
Union Pacific Coal Company.

On consideration of the motion to place this cause on the summary docket,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 7th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
559. vs.
Ninety-five Barrels, More or Less, of Alleged Apple Cider Vinegar, et al.

On consideration of the motion to take this cause from the summary docket,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America et al., Appellants,
666. vs.
American Railway Express Company et al.

Southeastern Express Company, Appellant,
667. vs.
American Railway Express Company et al.

Southern Traffic League et al., Appellants,
668. vs.
American Railway Express Company et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance these causes,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, April 14th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Missouri ex rel. The Burns National Bank of St. Joseph,
Plaintiff in Error,
762. vs.
A. B. Duncan, Judge of the Probate Court of Buchanan County, Missouri.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 7th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Missouri ex rel. The Burnes National Bank of St.Joseph,

Plaintiff in Error,

762. vs.

A. B. Duncan, Judge of the Probate Court of Buchanan County, Missouri.

On consideration of the motion of the United States for leave to file a brief herein as amicus curiae and to participate in the oral argument,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hygrade Provision Company, Inc., et al., Appellants,

403. vs.

Carl Sherman, Attorney General etc., et al.

Lewis & Fox Company, Appellant,

404. vs.

Carl Sherman, Attorney General etc., et al.

Harry Satz, Appellant,

405. vs.

Carl Sherman, Attorney General etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 7th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Company, Appellant,

789. vs.

540.

E. V. Kuykendall, as Director of Public Works of Washington, et al.,etc., et al.

The Home Telephone & Telegraph Company, Appellant,

790. vs.

539.

E. V. Kuykendall, as Director of Public Works of Washington, et al., etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance these causes,

It is now here ordered by this Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the causes assigned for argument, together, on Monday, April 14th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

S. C. Sandefur

679. vs.

Canoe Creek Coal Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 7th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. C. Walton, Appellant,

689. vs.

The House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 7th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Flo LaChapelle, as Administratrix of the Estate of Peter Foumakis, deceased,
Plaintiff in Error,

735. vs.

Union Pacific Coal Company.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error heretofore assigned for Monday, April 7th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mountain States Power Company,
Petitioner,

731. vs.

A. L. Jordan Lumber Company et al.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Patrick J. Donovan, Petitioner,

746. vs.

Cunard Steamship Company, Limited.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Steamer "Spokane", Her Engines etc.,

Petitioner,

748. vs.

Charles Steiner et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Will Avery, Petitioner,

749. vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Gillespie et al., doing business as Gillespie Brothers & Company,

Petitioners,

754. vs.

J. Aron & Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Rollin Abell, Petitioner,

755. vs.

General Motors Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari t to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein

of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arthur A. Kemp, Administrator of Michael John Kemp, etc.,

Petitioner,

756. vs.

Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas R. Wheeler, Petitioner,

758. vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wilbur L. Ball, Receiver of Haytian American Corporation,

Petitioner,

759. vs.

Breed, Elliott & Harrison.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Delia Holt, by her next friend Delia Holt,
Petitioner,
779. vs.
Missouri Pacific Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louis Cohen, Petitioner,
801. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fred P. Violette, Appellant,
143. vs.
James A. Walsh, Collector etc.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Montana for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ann S. O'Donnell, Appellant,
161. vs.
Ned T. Powell, as Treasurer etc., et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Sanitary District of Chicago, Appellant,
529. vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee.

Erie Railroad Company, Petitioner,
803. vs.
John Straker.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Bertha J. Strootman and Mr. John W. Ryan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hamilton Ward for the respondent.

Guaranty Title & Trust Company, Receiver of Vue de L'Eau Company, Appellant,
109. vs.
The United States.

On motion of Mr. H. H. Rumble in that behalf, the mandate in this cause was granted.

Kansas City Terminal Railway Company, et al., Petitioners,
821. vs.
Central Union Trust Company of New York, Trustee, etc., et al.

On motion of Mr. Joseph M. Bryson for Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad Company, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

The San Francisco and Portland Steamship Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
122. vs.
A. J. Parrington.

The motion to reconsider the rule announced in the case of Kansas City Southern Railway Company v. Wolfe was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. Prescott Gatley in behalf of counsel.

James C. Davis, as Agent etc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
123. vs.
A. J. Parrington.

M. E. Montgomery et al.,
Petitioners,
768. vs.
Pacific Electric Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Albert E. Sherman for the petitioners, and by Mr. Frank Karr and Mr. Oscar Lawler for the respondent.

James C. Davis, Agent provided by the Transportation Act of 1920,
Petitioner,
785. vs.
L. D. Alexander and Frank Griffith.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. O. Blake and Mr. W. R. Bleakmore for the petitioner.

C. A. Leeper et al., Petitioner,
798. vs.
The Lemon G. Neely Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. V. B. Archer for the petitioners.

The United States ex rel. The Greylock Mills,
Petitioner,
808. vs.
David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Craig Peacock and Mr. John W. Townsend for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Sewall Key for the respondent.

James C. Davis, Director General and Agent,
Petitioner,
809. vs.
John P. Barbee.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. O'B. Cooper, Mr. W. M. Hendren, and Mr. A. A. McLaughlin for the petitioner, and by Mr. R. C. Strudwick for the respondent.

Royal Italian Government,
Petitioner,
812. vs.
National Brass & Copper Tube Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel F. Frank for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harlan F. Stone for the respondent.

Kansas City Terminal Railway Company,et al., Petitioners,
821. vs.
Central Union Trust Company of New York, Trustee, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward J. White, Mr. N. H. Loomis, Mr. Bruce Scott, Mr. Gardiner Lathrop, Mr. Samuel W. Sawyer, Mr. H. H. Field, Mr. W. F. Dickinson, Mr. N. S. Brown, and Mr. F. H. Moore for the petitioners, and by Mr. Edward Cornell, Mr. Edward C. Eliot, and Mr. Leonard D. Adkins for the respondents.

Farmers & Mechanics National Bank,
Petitioner,
828. vs.
W. W. Wilkinson, Trustee.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edwin C. Brandenburg and Mr. Charles A. Boynton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Mark McMahon for the respondent.

The Pittsburgh & Lake Erie Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
833. vs.
Jacob McDonald.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William A. Seifert for the petitioner, and by Mr. Cornelius D. Scully for the respondent.

Willard H. Stimson et al.,
Appellants,
162. vs.
The City of Los Angeles et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Jess E. Stephens and Mr. Lucius P. Green for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. D. M. Delmas for the appellants.

C. Henry Smith, Plaintiff in Error,
199. vs.
Alfred Greenebaum.

In Error to the District Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, of the State of California.

It appearing to the Court that authority of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said authority, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

R. Asakura, Plaintiff in Error,
211. vs.
The City of Seattle et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. C. T. Donworth for the defendants in error, and submitted by Mr. D. V. Halverstadt for the plaintiff in error.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
240. vs.
Tommy Payne.

This cause was argued by Mr. H. L. Underwood for the appellant, and by Mr. Arthur E. Griffin for the appellee.

Raymond Moore, Plaintiff in Error,
253. vs.
The State of Idaho.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Karl Paine and Mr. Edwin A. Snow for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. A. H. Conner for the defendant in error.

Citizens Savings Bank & Trust Company,
Appellant,
261. vs.
Joseph F. Sexton, as Executor of the Estate of Quincy D. Chapman, deceased, et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Lawrence H. Brown for the appellant, and by Mr. James A. Williams for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George H. Macdonald, It is ordered that Francis V. Hertzig, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. A. Ayres, It is ordered that E. L. Foulke, Esquire, of Wichita, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. M. Pierce, It is ordered that Randolph Laughlin, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Wharton Pepper, It is ordered that John Wesley McWilliams, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl R. Chindblom, It is ordered that Walter F. Henieman, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert Ottinger, It is ordered that Douglass C. Lawrence, Esquire, of Freeport, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David R. Radovsky, It is ordered that Benjamin F. Evarts, Esquire, of Holycke, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David R. Radovsky, It is ordered that Samuel Barnet, Esquire, of New Bedford, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David R. Radovsky, It is ordered that George E. Gordon, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David R. Radovsky, It is ordered that Louis Swig, Esquire, of Taunton, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David R. Radovsky, It is ordered that Albert Hurwitz, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David R. Radovsky, It is ordered that Elihu A. Hershenson, Esquire, of Peabody, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David R. Radovsky, It is ordered that Joseph Talamo, Esquire, of Worcester, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David R. Radovsky, It is ordered that Benjamin J. Shoolman, Esquire, of Brookline, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David R. Radovsky, It is ordered that Morris Katzeff, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David R. Radovsky, It is ordered that Bennett Silverblatt, Esquire, of Lowell, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced that the Court will not convene until 2 o'clock tomorrow, to enable the members of the Court to attend the memorial services for the late President Harding in the Hall of the House of Representatives, at 12 o'clock noon.

Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company,

Petitioner,

268. vs.

O. J. Nichols.

This cause was argued by Mr. R. O. Brennan for the petitioner, and by Mr. M. K. Young for the respondent.

James C. Davis, as Agent etc.,
Petitioner,
297. vs.
R. L. Cornwell.

This cause was argued by Mr. I. Parker Veazey, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. George E. Hurd for the respondent.

Chung Fook, Petitioner,
299. vs.
Edward White, Commissioner of Immigration, etc.,

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Ottinger for the respondent.

Western Union Telegraph Company,
Petitioner,
300. vs.
J. A. Czizek.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Francis Raymond Stark for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 2 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. O'Brien, It is ordered that Harry Traverse, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Wharton Pepper, It is ordered that Edwin Haines Burgess, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Idaho Irrigation Company,Ltd., et al., Appellants,
324. vs.
Fred W. Gooding et al.

Fred W. Gooding et al., Appellants,
336. vs.
The Idaho Irrigation Company et al.

On motion of Mr. O. O. Haga in that behalf, It is ordered that these cases be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26,

Western Union Telegraph Company, Petitioner,
300. vs.
J. A. Czizek.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Francis Raymond Stark for the petitioner, by Mr. R. H. Johnson for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Beverly L. Hodghead for the respondent.

Frederick Hollister,
Plaintiff in Error,
309. vs.
Edwin Reed, Administrator etc.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

It appearing to the Court that an authority of the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said authority, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles J. Webb & Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
310. vs.
Pingree Cattle Loan Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. S. L. Hodgin for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Great Northern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
312. vs.
Galbreath Cattle Company et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. I. Parker Veazey, Jr., for the petitioner. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Clarence D. Keller et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
315. vs.
Adams-Campbell Company, Inc., et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. W. A. Loftus for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles S. Burg, It is ordered that W. W. Brown, Esquire, of Parsons, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. B. I. Salinger, It is ordered that Theodore Joseph Drees, Esquire, of Carroll, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl A. Mapes, It is ordered that A. G. Maul, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Clague, It is ordered that Wilfred E. Rumble, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Clague, It is ordered that Victor E. Anderson, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Abner Siegel, It is ordered that William B. Ritchie, Esquire, of Port Angeles, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins, It is ordered that Samuel Hershenstein, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Ex parte In the matter of David S. Seaman et al., Co-Executors under the Last Will of John W. Seaman, deceased,

Original. Petitioners,

lin for the petitioner.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of prohibition and/or a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Randolph Laugh-

Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis et al., Appellants,

425. vs.

The United States et al.

On motion of Mr. T. M. Pierce for John F. Lee and George M. Block, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amici curiae.

Sol N. Snitow, Petitioner,

842. vs.

Harry L. Wissing, Trustee.

The motion for a stay herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. Hershenstein in that behalf.

Clarence D. Keller et al., etc., Petitioners,

315. vs.

Adams-Campbell Company, Inc., et al.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. William A. Loftus for the petitioners; and the cause was submitted by Mr. Ford W. Harris for the respondents.

The United States, Appellant,

358. vs.

Title Insurance & Trust Company et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. George A. H. Fraser for the appellant, and by Mr. Walter K. Tuller for the appellees.

I. Goto et al., Appellants,

463. vs.

John C. Lane, High Sheriff etc.

The motion for leave to file a brief of The United States herein as amicus curiae was granted. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Thomas W. Gregory for the appellants, and continued by Mr. Frederick Milverton for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 29, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John S. Boyd, It is ordered that Leslie E. Greene, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John B. Meserve, It is ordered that Claude H. Rosenstein, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

I. Goto et al., Appellants,
463. vs.
John C. Lane, High Sheriff etc.
Mr. T. W. Gregory for the appellants.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Frederick Melverton for the appellee, and concluded by

United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company, Appellant,
656. vs.
Joe H. Strain, Bank Commissioner of the State of Oklahoma, et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. C. B. Ames for the appellant, and by Mr. George F. Short for the appellees.

Peterson Oil Company, Plaintiff in Error,

343. vs.

Guy G. Frary, State Inspector etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. Blaine Simons for the plaintiff in error, and submitted by Mr. Clarence C. Caldwell for the defendant in error.

Commonwealth Trust Company of Pittsburgh, Appellant,

18. vs.

Max Smith et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. O. O. Haga for the appellant, and submitted by Mr. Turner K. Hackman for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, MARCH 3, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. A. Keeling, It is ordered that Clyde A. Sweeton, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel W. Moore, It is ordered that Nathan Ballin, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry C. Hart, It is ordered that Hoyt Webb Lark, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David P. Wolhaupter, It is ordered that Neill F. Towner, Esquire, of Albany, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Wharton Pepper, It is ordered that James A. Regan, Jr., Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham, It is ordered that Clarence J. Hoyt, Esquire, of Youngstown, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clark Burdick, It is ordered that Philip C. Joslin, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Clagett, It is ordered that Louis Goldman, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry M. Ward, It is ordered that William H. Dougherty, Esquire, of Janesville, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Edwin N. Cherrington, Esquire, of Gallipolis, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert H. Lovett, It is ordered that Joseph Davis, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Harry C. McKannay, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Wesley M. Smith, Appellant,

124. vs.

Walter T. Apple.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, transferred to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, pursuant to the Act of Congress of September 14, 1922.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Chicago, Indianapolis & Louisville Railway Company, Chicago & Erie Railroad Company, et al.,

Appellants,

489. vs.

The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, The New York Central Railroad Company, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Sutherland,

Mr. Justice McReynolds,

Mr. Justice Sanford.

Manufacturers' Land & Improvement Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation and Public Service Railway Company. — In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

181.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice McKenna.

C. J. Erickson and United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States of America and United States Spruce Production Corporation. — In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

125.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court sustaining the jurisdiction of that Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas et al. — It is ordered by this Court that the consideration of the motion that the Receiver herein return certain lands and funds be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the receipt of the Commissioner's Report.

15, Orig'l.

The Sanitary District of Chicago, Appellant,
529. vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 10th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of David S. Seaman et al., Co-Executors etc., Original. Petitioners,

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of prohibition and/or a writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Margaret C. Lynch, Executrix of the Last Will and Testament of E. J. Lynch, deceased, Petitioner,
784. vs.
Alworth-Stephens Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry Lewis, Petitioner,
807. vs.
Davis Roberts, Jr., as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Montevallo Mining Company, Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

L. H. Myers et al.,
Petitioners,
818. vs.
Charles H. Anderson et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

David J. Sheehan, Petitioner,
760. vs.
Braddock Coal Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Claude W. Johnson, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Kentucky Iron & Steel Company, Bankrupt,
Petitioner,
769. vs.
Louisville Trust Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John E. Mathewson, as Administrator of Rufus Overlander, deceased,

Petitioner,

770. vs.

Elizabeth Jane Richards.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George D. Proctor, Petitioner,

773. vs.

M. William Rossi et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Reading Company, Successor to Philadelphia & Reading Company,

Petitioner,

777. vs.

Esther H. Fessler, as Administratrix etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation,
Petitioner,
787. vs.
The Chase National Bank of the City of New York et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Safe-Cabinet Company,
Petitioner,
791. vs.
The Globe-Wernicke Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Anglo-American Oil Company, Ltd.,
Petitioner,
814. vs.
R. J. Green, Claimant of the Steamship "G. R. Crowe", Her Engines etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

M. E. Montgomery et al.,
Petitioners,
768. vs.
Pacific Electric Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. A. Leeper et al.,
Petitioners,
798. vs.
The Lemon G. Neely Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Erie Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
803. vs.
John Straker.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States ex relatione The Greylock Mills,

Petitioner,

808. vs.

David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Willard H. Stimson et al.,

Appellants,

162. vs.

The City of Los Angeles et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions to dismiss for lack of a substantial Federal question.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Raymond Moore, Plaintiff in Error,

253. vs.

The State of Idaho.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Peterson Oil Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
343. vs.
Guy G. Frary, State Inspector etc.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company, Appellant,
656. vs.
Joe H. Strain, Bank Commissioner of the State of Oklahoma, et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles J. Webb & Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
310. vs.
Pingree Cattle Loan Company.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Great Northern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
312. vs.
Galbraith Cattle Company et al.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Montana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Missouri ex rel. The Burnes National Bank of St. Joseph,
Plaintiff in Error,
762. vs.
A. B. Duncan, Judge of the Probate Court of Buchanan County, Missouri.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Justin D. Bowersock, and Mr. William T. Jones for the petitioner.

Ziang Sung Wan, Petitioner,
451. vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf, this cause was reassigned for argument on Monday, March 10th.

Webster Electric Company,
Petitioner,
93. vs.
Splitdorf Electrical Company.

On motion of Mr. E. J. Prindle, pro se, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

Thomas S. Meiburst, Petitioner,
762. vs.
S. S. "South American", et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Challen B. Ellis and Mr. Silas B. Axtel for the petitioner, and by Mr. Bertrand L. Pettigrew for the respondents.

Southeastern Express Company,
Appellant,
216. vs.
Stokes V. Robertson, State Revenue Agent, et al.

The resignations of Stokes V. Robertson, as State Revenue Agent of the State of Mississippi, and of W. J. Miller, as State Auditor of the State of Mississippi, were suggested; and W. J. Miller, present State Revenue Agent of the State of Mississippi, and George D. Riley, present State Auditor of the State of Mississippi, were ordered substituted as the parties appellees in this cause.

James Seward, Plaintiff in Error,
848. vs.
Raymond H. Brady, Sheriff of Jefferson County, Missouri.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Frans E. Lindquist, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of Raymond McConigle,
Original. Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frans E. Lindquist for the petitioner.

William R. Rodman, U. S. Marshal,
Petitioner,
546. vs.
Roland R. Pothier.

The motion for leave to file a brief herein as amicus curiae and to participate in the oral argument was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins in that behalf.

George F. Rockhold, Trustee,
Petitioner,
822. vs.
Isaac Daniel Buie, Bankrupt.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. M. Etheridge and Mr. J. M. McCormick for the petitioner.

Hughes Electric Company,
Petitioner,
829. vs.
Lena Greyerbiehl.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Aubrey Lawrence and Mr. Matthew W. Murphy for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. L. Knauf for the respondent.

T. Hogan & Sons, Inc.,
Petitioner,
847. vs.
Joseph Miller and L. Boyer's Sons Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Eli J. Blair for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harold R. Medina for the respondents.

Continental & Commercial Trust & Savings Bank,
Plaintiff in Error,
504. vs.
Wilhelmina Werner et al.

Motion to dismiss the writ of error and deny the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William W. Ray and Mr. M. F. Ryan for the defendants in error and respondents in support of the motion, and by Mr. Oliver O. Haga for the plaintiff in error and petitioner in opposition thereto.

Twin Falls Salmon River Land & Water Company et al.,
Appellants,
19. vs.
A. E. Caldwell et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Oliver O. Haga for the appellants, and by Mr. James R. Bothwell for the appellees.

Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis et al.,
Appellants,
425. vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. R. V. Fletcher for the appellants, and continued by Mr. T. M. Pierce for the appellants and by Mr. J. M. Bryson for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, MARCH 4, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James M. Gillett, It is ordered that Nathan Moran, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard B. Montgomery, It is ordered that Walter Carroll, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert G. McCaleb, It is ordered that Lynn A. Williams, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Cox, It is ordered that Joseph T. Bethel, Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Cox, It is ordered that Minitree J. Fulton, Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert G. McCaleb, It is ordered that Clifford C. Bradbury, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis et al., Appellants,
425. vs.
The United States et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. J. M. Bryson and Mr. Edward J. White for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. T. M. Pierce for the appellant.

The United States of America et al., Appellants,
456. vs.
Abilene & Southern Railway Company et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Clifford Histed for William T. Kemper, Receiver of Kansas City, Mexico & Orient Railroad Company, et al., interveners, continued by Mr. T. J. Norton and Mr. M. G. Roberts for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. J. Carter Fort for the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants,
565. vs.
Consolidated Gas Company of New York.

This cause was argued by Mr. Harry Hertzoff for the appellant, and submitted by Mr. John A. Garver for the appellee.

Piel Brothers, Appellant,
95. vs.
Ralph A. Day, Federal Prohibition Director for the State of New York; John T. Rafferty, Collector of Internal Revenue for the First District of New York, et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James Everard's Breweries, Appellant,
200. vs.
Ralph A. Day, Prohibition Director, etc., et al.

Edward and John Burke, Limited, Appellant,
245. vs.
David H. Blair.

Three hours were allowed for the argument of this cause.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. S. W. Moore for the appellant in No. 245.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Samuel Topliff, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that H. H. Griswold, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Burton L. French, It is ordered that Arthur G. Shoup, Esquire, of Juneau, Territory of Alaska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Central National Bank of Tulsa, Oklahoma, Plaintiff in Error,
165. vs.
The United States of America.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by

Mr. James W. Beller for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James Everard's Breweries, Appellant,
200. vs.
Ralph A. Day, Prohibition Director etc., et al.

Edward and John Burke, Limited, Appellant,
245. vs.
David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Leave was granted to file brief of the Attorneys General of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, West Virginia, and Wyoming, herein, as amici curiae.

James Everard's Breweries, Appellant,
200. vs.
Ralph A. Day, Prohibition Director etc., et al.

Edward and John Burke, Limited, Appellant,
245. vs.
David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Leave was granted counsel for the appellees to file a supplemental brief herein, with leave to counsel for the appellants to file a reply thereto.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. S. W. Moore for the appellant in No. 245, by Mr. Nathan Ballin for the appellant in No. 200, by Mr. Joseph S. Auerbach for Samuel W. Lambert as amicus curiae in No. 200, by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellees, by Mr. H. H. Griswold for the Attorneys General of twenty-five States as amici curiae in Nos. 200 and 245, and concluded by Mr. S. W. Moore for the appellant in No. 245.

Southeastern Express Company, Plaintiff in Error,
201. vs.
W. J. Miller, State Revenue Agent etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. Sanders McDaniel for the plaintiff in error, and submitted by Mr. R. A. Collins for the defendant in error.

Louisiana Public Service Commission et al., Appellants,

421. vs.

Morgan's Louisiana & Texas Railway & Steamship Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. W. M. Barrow for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, MARCH 6, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Howard W. Ameli, It is ordered that Lawrence D. Connelly, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas M. Baker, It is ordered that Jay Irving Moskow, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Howard W. Ameli, It is ordered that George H. Stover, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Howard W. Ameli, It is ordered that Charles McG. Roberts, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Howard W. Ameli, It is ordered that William G. Fullen, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William W. Arnold, It is ordered that Guy L. Smith, Esquire, of Pana, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William W. Arnold, It is ordered that J. Earl Major, Esquire, of Hillsboro, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Byrns, It is ordered that Homer T. Amis, Esquire, of Springfield, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ballard Moore, It is ordered that Albert F. Nathan, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John G. Buchanan, It is ordered that Selden S. Dickinson, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John G. Buchanan, It is ordered that Charles A. Wagner, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Webster Electric Company, Petitioner, 93. vs. Splitdorf Electrical Company.	The motion of Mr. Albert F. Nathan for leave to file a brief herein as amicus curiae was denied.
Louisiana Public Service Commission et al., Appellants, 421. vs. Morgan's Louisiana & Texas Railroad & Steamship Company.	The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. W. M. Barrow for the appellants, by Mr. Henry H. Chaffe for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. W. M. Barrow for the appellants.
Nyanza Steamship Company, appellant, 307. vs. Jahncke Drydock No. 1 et al.	This cause was argued by Mr. Richard B. Montgomery for the appellant, and by Mr. Walter Carroll for the appellees.
United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error, 337. vs. Mary L. Morrell.	This cause was argued by Mr. E. B. Moulton for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. Henry C. Hart for the defendants in error.
Webster Electric Company, Petitioner, 93. vs. Splitdorf Electrical Company.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Albert G. McCaleb for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, MARCH 7, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roy G. Fitzgerald, It is ordered that George F. Holland, Esquire, of Dayton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Byrnes, It is ordered that Horace B. Stout, of Clarksville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. A. Wheat, It is ordered that William C. Breed, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles V. Imlay, It is ordered that Clarence M. Eubanks, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John B. Golden, It is ordered that Nicholas D. DiSesa, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Webster Electric Company,
Petitioner,
93. vs.
Splitdorf Electrical Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Albert G. McCaleb for the petitioner, by Mr. Charles L. Sturtevant for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Lyon A. Williams for the petitioner.

Federal Trade Commission,
Plaintiff in Error,
206. vs.
American Tobacco Company.
Federal Trade Commission,
Plaintiff in Error,
207. vs.
P. Lorillard Company, Inc.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. James A. Fowler for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. William D. Guthrie for the defendant in error in No. 207, by Mr. Junius Parker for the defendant in error in No. 206, and concluded by Mr. James A. Fowler for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, MARCH 10, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. D. McReynolds, It is ordered that L. D. Miller, Esquire, of Chattanooga, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur M. Free, It is ordered that Welburn Mayock, Esquire, of San Jose, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward F. McClennen, It is ordered that Clarence M. Gordon, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George W. Norris, It is ordered that Daniel W. Livingston, Esquire, of Nebraska City, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Driver, It is ordered that C. A. Cunningham, Esquire, of Blytheville, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward F. McClennen, It is ordered that Louis Goldberg, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., It is ordered that John C. Jones, Jr., Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward F. McClennen, It is ordered that John H. Devine, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Mortimer C. Rhone, It is ordered that Ellis L. Orvis, Esquire, of Bellefonte, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward S. Bailey, It is ordered that John C. Spaulding, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Winter, It is ordered that Alfred H. Beach, Esquire, of Casper, State of Wyoming, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Howell Van Auken, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Carter Fort, It is ordered that Harold J. Clark, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. W. Vanderwort, It is ordered that Francis P. Moats, Esquire, of Parkersburg, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. W. Vanderwort, It is ordered that Robert B. McDougle, Esquire, of Parkersburg, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward G. Griffin, It is ordered that Oliver D. Burden, Esquire, of Syracuse, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Henry S. Sweeney, Esquire, of Petoskey, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Joseph Radice, Plaintiff in Error. In Error to the City Court of
176. vs. Buffalo, State of New York.
The People of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the City Court of Buffalo, State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said City Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

August Dorchy, Plaintiff in Error,
163. vs.
The State of Kansas.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed without costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Western Union Telegraph Company,
Petitioner,
300. vs.
J. A. Czizek.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Idaho for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Tacoma Grain Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
693. vs.
Northern Pacific Railway Company.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sol D. Snitow, Petitioner,
842. vs.
Harry L. Wissing, Trustee.

On consideration of the motion for a stay in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of Raymond McGonigle,
—,
Original. Petitioner,

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William R. Redman, U. S. Marshal,
546. vs.
Roland R. Pothier.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a brief herein on behalf of General Adelbert Cronkhite as amicus curiae,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

It is further ordered that the motion for leave to participate in the oral argument herein be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Continental & Commercial Trust & Savings Bank,

Plaintiff in Error,

504. vs.

Wilhelmina Werner et al.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss the writ of error and deny the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

It is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, placed on the summary docket and assigned for argument on Monday, April 7th, next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Missouri ex rel. The Burnes National Bank of St. Joseph,

Plaintiff in Error,

762. vs.

A. B. Duncan, Judge of the Probate Court of Buchanan County, Missouri.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

Royal Italian Government,

Petitioner,

812. vs.

National Brass & Copper Tube Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied, for failure to file within the time prescribed by the statute.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas S. Medhurst, Petitioner,

752. vs.

S. S. "South American" et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be,

and the same is hereby, denied, for failure to file within the time prescribed by the statute.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Director General and Agent, Petitioner,
809. vs.
John P. Barbee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kansas City Terminal Railway Company et al., Petitioners,
821. vs.
Central Union Trust Company of New York, Trustees etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Pittsburgh & Lake Erie Railroad Company, Petitioner,
833. vs.
Jacob McDonald.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George F. Rockhold, Trustee,
Petitioner,
822. vs.
Isaac Daniel Buie, Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Farmers & Mechanics National Bank,
Petitioner,
828. vs.
W. W. Wilkinson, Trustee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Hughes Electric Company,
Petitioner,
829. vs.
Lena Greyerbiehl.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

T. Hogan & Sons, Inc., Petitioner,
847. vs.
Joseph Miller and L. Boyer's Sons Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of coun-

sel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
Consolidated Gas Company of New York et al.

565.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Mary L. Morrell.

337.

In Error to the Superior Court of the State of Rhode Island.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court of the State of Rhode Island, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

ORDER. The Court will take a recess from Monday, March 17th, until Monday, April 7th, next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America et al., Appellants,
627. vs.
The New River Company et al.

Slab Fork Coal Company et al., Appellants,
628. vs.
New River Company et al.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf.

The Delaware & Hudson Company et al., Appellants,
633. vs.
The United States of America et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf.

The Chastleton Corporation et al., Appellants,
467. vs.
A. Leftwich Sinclair et al.

The motion for leave to file a brief herein as amicus curiae was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. G. Griffin for the State of New York; and the motion was denied.

George R. Meek, Petitioner,
590. vs.
Centre County Banking Company et al., etc.

Florence F. Dale, Petitioner,
591. vs.
Centre County Banking Company et al., etc.

Andrew Breeze, Petitioner,
592. vs.
Centre County Banking Company et al., etc.

The suggestion of death of John M. Shugert, and motion to dismiss, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. C. Rhone for the petitioners in support of the motion, and by Mr. Samuel D. Gettig and Mr. Newton B. Spangler for the respondents in opposition thereto.

James B. Dillingham, as President, et al., etc., Appellants,
690. vs.
George V. McLaughlin, as Superintendent of Banks of the State of New York, et al.

George V. McLaughlin, as Superintendent of Banks of the State of New York, et al., Appellants,
691. vs.
James B. Dillingham, as President, et al., etc.

The motion to reassign these cases was denied.
On motion of Mr. Oliver D. Burden for the appellees and cross-appellants, leave was granted to file a supplemental brief herein.

Walter L. Marr, Appellant,
686. vs.
The United States.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf.

Southern Pacific Company,
Appellant,
810. vs.
The United States.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William R. Harr for the appellant.

James C. Davis, Director General etc., Petitioner,
819. vs.
Corona Coal Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeal, Parish of Orleans, State of Louisiana, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Denegre, Mr. Victor Leovy, and Mr. Henry H. Chaffe for the petitioner.

Herschell Norman, Petitioner,
826. vs.
The State of Ohio.

The The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., Mr. Hollis C. Johnston, and Mr. James C. Nicholson for the petitioner. On motion of Mr. Otto Schlobohm in behalf of counsel for the respondent, leave was granted to file a brief herein within ten days.

William R. Rodman, U. S. Marshal,
Petitioner,
546. vs.
Roland R. Pothier.

On motion of Mr. Fulton Brylawski for Mr. Louis Marshal, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae; and the motion for leave to participate in the oral argument herein was denied.

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Appellant,
852. vs.
The City of Parkersburg.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. W. Vandervort for the appellant in support of the petition, and by Mr. Francis P. Moats and Mr. Robert P. McDougle for the appellee in opposition thereto.

Welch, Fairchild & Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
797. vs.
Philippine National Bank.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr.

James Ross and Mr. Timothy T. Ansberry for the petitioner, with leave to counsel for the respondent to file a brief in opposition to the petition.

The State of Arkansas, Complainant,
2, Orig'l. vs.
The State of Tennessee.

On motion of Mr. Hugh H. Obear in that behalf, the hearing on defendant's exceptions was postponed, per stipulation, until the filing of a supplemental report of the Commissioners.

William Lucking, Appellant,
212. vs.
Detroit & Cleveland Navigation Company.

The motion for leave to file a brief of the Attorney General of Michigan herein as amicus curiae was denied.

Gulf & Ship Island Railroad Company et al., Petitioners,
792. vs.
W. M. Powell.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. L. Mayes, Mr. B. E. Eaton, Mr. T. J. Wills, Mr. Francis Raymond Stark, and Mr. Joseph L. Egan for the petitioners, and by Mr. R. L. McLaurin for the respondent.

Salt Lake County, petitioner,
802. vs.
Utah Copper Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles C. Richards for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. C. Ellis, Jr., for the respondent.

John Douglas, Jr., Petitioner,
832. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George H. Rankin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

The Savannah Chemical Company,
Petitioner,
837. vs.
W. R. Grace & Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. A. Lawrence for the petitioner, and by Mr. Paul B. Seabrook for the respondent.

Samuel Freshman, Petitioner,
840. vs.
W. S. Atkins.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph Manson McCormick and Mr. Francis Marion Etheridge for the petitioner.

Conron Bros. Company, Petitioner,
843. vs.
The Farmers Loan & Trust Company, Trustee, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted by Mr. Mark Ash and Mr. Edward Ash for the petitioner, and by Mr. Mansfield Ferry, Mr. George S. Graham, and Mr. George H. Richards for the respondents.

Commonwealth Steamship Company, Limited, Claimant of the Steamship "Turret Crown", etc.,
Petitioner,
857. vs.
Patent Vulcanite Roofing Company, Inc.
Commonwealth Steamship Company, Limited, Claimant of the Steamship "Turret Crown", etc., Petitioner,
858. vs.
Carlo Repetto.
Commonwealth Steamship Company, Limited, Claimant of the Steamship "Turret Crown", etc., Petitioner,
859. vs.
Sacco & Palmiero.
Commonwealth Steamship Company, Limited, Claimant of the Steamship "Turret Crown", etc., Petitioner,
860. vs.
J. Aron & Company, Inc.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John M. Woolsey, Mr. Clarence R. Hickox, and Mr. Theodore M. Hequembourg for the petitioner, and by Mr. D. Roger Englar for the respondents.

Gulf Refining Company of Louisiana,

Plaintiff in Error,

468. vs.

W. M. McFarland, Supervisor of Public Accounts.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. V. Coco, Mr. Harry P. Sneed, and Mr. S. L. Herold for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. D. Edward Greer for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Waldemar Gnerich & Jeremiah T. Regan, Copartners doing business under the firm name and style of B. & S. Drug Company,

Appellants,

79. vs.

S. F. Rutter, as Prohibition Director etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. H. G. McKannay for the appellants, and by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the appellee.

The United States of America,

Plaintiff in Error,

204. vs.

River Rouge Improvement Company et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. Selden S. Dickinson and Mr. Charles A. Wagner for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

Merlin W. Hixson,
Plaintiff in Error,
420. vs.
Louis D. Oakes,

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mrs. Mabel Walker Willebrandt in behalf of counsel.

James B. Dillingham, as President, et al., etc.,
Appellants,
690. vs.
George V. McLaughlin, as Superintendent of Banks etc., et al.

George V. McLaughlin, as Superintendent of Banks etc., et al.,
Appellants,
691. vs.
James B. Dillingham, as President, et al.

These cases were reassigned for argument on Monday, March 17th, on the summary docket.

The United States,
Plaintiff in Error,
204. vs.
River Rouge Improvement Company et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Charles A. Wagner for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. Alfred Lucking for the plaintiff in error.

The United States, Appellant,
205. vs.
Alphonse Gay.
King for the appellee.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Lovett for the appellant, and by Mr. George A.

George L. Mesker et al., Trustees etc., Appellants,
208. vs.
Ohio River Sand Company et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Helm Bruce for the appellants, and by Mr. John B. Baskin for the appellees.

William Lucking, Appellant,
212. vs.
Detroit & Cleveland Navigation Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William Lucking for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John H. Devine, It is ordered that Harry C. Seligman, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh LaMaster, It is ordered that George W. Ayres, Esquire, of Lincoln, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

William Lucking, Appellant,
212. vs.
Detroit & Cleveland Navigation Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. William Lucking for the appellant, by Mr. Alexis C. Angell for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. William Lucking for the appellant.

Edward A. Thurston, Sole Surviving Trustee etc., Petitioner,
215. vs.
Benjamin Brown et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Edward F. McClennen for the petitioner, continued by Mr. John H. Devine for the respondents Crockford and Murphy and Holbrook, by Mr. Louis Goldberg for the respondent Brown, and concluded by Mr. Edward

Supreme Lodge, Knights of Pythias,
Plaintiff in Error,
214. vs.
George O. Meyer.

Supreme Lodge, Knights of Pythias,
Plaintiff in Error,
215. vs.
Lena Kiser.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. W. J. Connell for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. D. W. Livingston for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. Sol H. Esary for the plaintiff in error.

The Chastle Corporation et al.,
Appellants,
467. vs.
A. Leftwich Sinclair et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. W. Gwynn Gardiner for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Ross Hull, It is ordered that Rose Ruthenberg, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Patrick H. Loughran, It is ordered that Lewis E. Hoffman, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ray M. Van Doren, It is ordered that Harry M.Seidenberg, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chastleton Corporation et al., Appellants, 467. vs. A. Leftwich Sinclair et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. W. Gwynn Gardiner for the appellants, by Mr. Chapin Brown for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. R. H. McNeill for the appellees.

The Oliver American Trading Company, Inc., Plaintiff in Error,
662. vs.
The Government of the United States of Mexico et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Alfred Hayes for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Jerome S. Hess for the defendants in error.

George R. Meek, Petitioner,
590. vs.
Centre County Banking Company et al.

Florence F. Dale, Petitioner,
591. vs.
Centre County Banking Company et al.

Andrew Breeze, Petitioner,
592. vs.
Centre County Banking Company et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Mortimer C. Rhone for the petitioners, continued by Mr. S. D. Gettig and Mr. H. B. Spangler for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Ellis L. Orvis for the petitioners.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, MARCH 14, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Howard T. Jones, It is ordered that John Robert Jones, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry L. Underwood, It is ordered that Warren McLaine, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry L. Underwood, It is ordered that Thomas Moore Simonton, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward E. Browne, It is ordered that William E. Fisher, Esquire, of Stevens Point, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis Marshall, It is ordered that Raymond Kelner, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Company, Petitioner,
517. vs.
James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, Agent.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. C. H. Browder for the petitioner, continued by Mr. George B. Pugh and Mr. A. A. McLaughlin for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. C. A. Cunningham for the petitioner.

George Carroll et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
117. vs.
The United States.

This cause was reargued by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the defendant in error, and submitted by Mr. Thomas E. Atkinson and Mr. Clare J. Hall for the plaintiffs in error, with leave to counsel for the plaintiffs in error to file an additional brief within one week.

William R. Rodman, United States Marshal, Petitioner,
546. vs.
Roland R. Pothier.

This cause was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner, and by Mr. Louis Marshall for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next, at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, MARCH 17, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry R. Rathbone, It is ordered that Frank A. McDonnell, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry R. Rathbone, It is ordered that Francis Borrelli, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry R. Rathbone, It is ordered that Stephen A. Malato, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry R. Rathbone, It is ordered that Michael L. Rosinia, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Porter J. McCumber, It is ordered that Homer Sullivan, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward G. Griffin, It is ordered that Clarence S. Ferris, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Oliver D. Burden, It is ordered that Samuel H. Wandell, Esquire, of Potsdam, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Oliver D. Burden, It is ordered that Charles Sumner Miller, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert Ottinger, It is ordered that Francis Colgate Dale, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ivan Bowen, It is ordered that LeRoy Bowen, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Willis G. Sears, It is ordered that John Webster Rice, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Israel M. Foster, It is ordered that Charles Boyd, Esquire, of Wellsville, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Israel M. Foster, It is ordered that George D. Ingram, Esquire, of Wellsville, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Israel M. Foster, It is ordered that Harry Brokaw, Esquire, of East Liverpool, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry H. Snelling, It is ordered that Halbert P. Brown, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of This Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Henry Butler, It is ordered that John F. Cronan, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Citizens Savings Bank and Trust Company, Appellant, vs. Joseph F. Sexton, as Executor of the Estate of Quincy D. Chapman, deceased, et al. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Washington.

261.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

First National Bank of Columbus, Ohio,
Appellant,
509. vs.
Louisiana Highway Commission and Howell Morgan, Treasurer of the State of Louisiana.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana, and on motion to affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Federal Trade Commission,
Plaintiff in Error,
206. vs.
American Tobacco Company.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Federal Trade Commission,
Plaintiff in Error,
207. vs.
P. Lorillard Company, Inc.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

George L. Mesker and George Heilman, the latter as Trustee etc., Appellants,
208. vs.
Ohio River Sand Company et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gulf Refining Company of Louisiana, Plaintiff in Error,
468. vs.
W. N. McFarland, Supervisor of Public Accounts.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hannah Canard Barnett et al., Appellants,
134. vs.
W. A. Kunkel et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

It is ordered by this Court that there be added to the opinion already filed herein the following: "The third section of the Act of Congress approved May 25, 1910, ch. 408, 36 St. 836, was repealed by the last paragraph of section 297 of the Judicial Code approved March 3, 1911, ch. 231, 36 St. 1087, 1169". The petition for rehearing is denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America et al., Appellants, vs. The New River Company et al. 627.

Slab Fork Coal Company et al., Appellants, vs. The New River Company et al. 628.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the causes assigned for argument on Monday, April 21st next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Delaware & Hudson Company et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America et al. 633.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Walter L. Marr, Appellant, vs. The United States. 686.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 10th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Pacific Company, Appellant, vs. The United States. 810.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Merlin W. Hixson, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Louis D. Oakes. 420.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 21st next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Director General etc., Petitioner,
819. vs.
Corona Coal Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeal, Parish of Orleans, State of Louisiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeal, Parish of Orleans, State of Louisiana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Appellant,
852. vs.
The City of Parkersburg.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the appeal.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Horace Van Devanter, Petitioner,
657. vs.
Wholesale Merchants Warehouse Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gulf & Ship Island Railroad Company et al., Petitioners,
792. vs.
W. E. Powell.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

Welch, Fairchild & Company, Inc., Petitioner,
797. vs.
Philippine National Bank.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

March 17, 1924.

Salt Lake County, Petitioner,
802. vs.
Utah Copper Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Douglas, Jr., Petitioner,
832. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Savannah Chemical Company, Petitioner,
837. vs.
W. R. Grace & Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the

argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Conron Bros. & Company,
Petitioner,
843. vs.
The Farmers Loan & Trust Company, Trustee etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Commonwealth Steamship Company, Limited, Claimant of the Steamship "Turret Crown", etc.,
Petitioner,
857. vs.
Patent Vulcanite Roofing Company, Inc.
Commonwealth Steamship Company, Limited, Claimant of the Steamship "Turret Crown", etc.,
Petitioner,
858. vs.
Carlo Repetto.
Commonwealth Steamship Company, Limited, Claimant of the Steamship "Turret Crown", etc.
Petitioner,
859. vs.
Sacco & Palmieri.
Commonwealth Steamship Company, Limited, Claimant of the Steamship "Turret Crown", etc.,
Petitioner,
860. vs.
J. Aron & Company, Inc.

On petition for writs of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of the Modern Workmen of the World and the Modern Workmen of the World Society,

Orig'l. Petitioners,

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. Bissell Thomas for the petitioners.

W. F. Gravins, Petitioner,

570. vs.

Walker D. Hines, Director General etc.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David H. Leake and Mr. Walter Leake for the respondent in support of the petition, and by Mr. Robert H. Talley and Mr. Joseph W. Cox for the petitioner in opposition thereto.

W. F. Richardson, Jr., Company, Inc., Plaintiff in Error,

603. vs.

Walker D. Hines, Director General etc.

Mayo Milling Company, Inc., Plaintiff in Error,

604. vs.

Walker D. Hines, Director General etc.

Adams Grain & Provision Company, Plaintiff in Error,

605. vs.

Walker D. Hines, Director General etc.

Adams Grain & Provision Company, Plaintiff in Error,

606. vs.

John Barton Payne, Director General etc.

The motion to dismiss in these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David H. Leake and Mr. Walter Leake for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Robert H. Talley for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Nevada State Journal Publishing Company et al.,

Petitioners,

804. vs.

Charles B. Henderson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Glynn, Mr. E. E. Roberts, and Mr. Richard A. Ford for the petitioners.

Luckenbach Steamship Company et al.

745. vs.

Norwegian Barque "Thekla", her Tackle, etc.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. R. Alden in that behalf.

The Charles Wolff Packing Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Court of Industrial Relations of the State of Kansas. 622 & 839.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. E. Gann in that behalf.

Vernon Hall, Trustee, Petitioner, vs. Lynn Reager, Bankrupt. 825.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. J. Rutledge, Jr., and Mr. J. E. Gilbert for the petitioner, and by Mr. Francis Marion Etheridge and Mr. Joseph Manson McCormick for the respondent.

Adolph Paleais, Petitioner, vs. Lewis H. Saper. 850.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph G. M. Browne and Mr. Barnett E. Kopelman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Archibald Palmer for the respondent.

David A. Manville & Company, Inc., Petitioner, vs. Francis Oil & Refining Company. 851.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph G. M. Browne for the petitioner.

Concrete Appliances Company et al., Petitioners, vs. John E. Gomery et al. 856.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Stephen J. Cox, Mr. Arthur M. Hood, and Mr. Cyrus M. Anderson for the petitioners, and by Mr. George Bayard Jones, Mr. Thomas F. Sheridan and Mr. William Steele Jackson for the respondents.

Clay Cocke, Petitioner, vs. United States of America. 864.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit

Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. A. Templeton, Mr. E. C. Brandenburg, Mr. Charles A. Boynton, and Mr. E. Howard McCaleb for the petitioner.

North Carolina Railroad Company, Petitioner,
879. vs.
C. D. Story, Sheriff of Alamance County, North Carolina, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. H. Prince, Mr. H. O'B. Cooper, Mr. W. M. Hendren, and Mr. L. E. Jeffries for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. P. Bynum and Mr. R. C. Strudwick for the respondent.

M. Massei, Jr., Petitioner,
876. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert H. Talley for the petitioner.

Arturo F. Lapham, Appellant,
836. vs.
The United States ex rel. Antonio Escudero et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Central Lumber Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
507. vs.
Charles Carlisle.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James B. Dillingham, as President, et al., etc.,

Appellants,

690. vs.

George V. McLaughlin, as Superintendent of Banks of the State of New York, et al.

George V. McLaughlin, as Superintendent of Banks of the State of New York, et al.,

Appellants,

691. vs.

James B. Dillingham, as President, et al., etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. O. D. Burden for the appellants and cross-appellees, and by Mr. Edward G. Griffin for the appellees and cross-appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, April 7th next, at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., It is ordered that Frederic L. Clark, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., It is ordered that Henry Necarsulmer, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counlor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tilman B. Parks, It is ordered that Pat McNalley, Esquire, of El Dorado, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins, It is ordered that Morgan J. Doyle, Esquire, of Casper, State of Wyoming, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles S. Thomas, It is ordered that Wolcott H. Pitkin, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chester A. Gwinn, It is ordered that Robert A. Littleton, Esquire, of Chattanooga, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Austin V. Cannon, It is ordered that W. J. Dawley, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tilman B. Parks, It is ordered that G. G. Pope, Esquire, of Texarkana, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. G. Bissell, It is ordered that Edward A. Walters, Esquire, of Twin Falls, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, It is ordered that Charles A. Leach, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Barrett Prettyman, It is ordered that Philip G. Sheehy, Esquire, of San Jose, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank S. Bright, It is ordered that Brison Howie, Esquire, of New Rochelle, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chapin Brown, It is ordered that Jacob Halper, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tilman B. Parks, It is ordered that Aylmer Flenniken, Esquire, of El Dorado, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George V. A. McCloskey, It is ordered that Lawrence N. Martin, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. Silo Gottlieb, It is ordered that Benjamin Winograd, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Bronte Greenwood, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank S. Bright, It is ordered that George Augustus Wilson, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James J. Mayfield, It is ordered that Nimrod Davis Denson, Jr., Esquire, of Opelika, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Dennis, It is ordered that Robert M. Rieser, Esquire, of Madison, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tilman B. Parks, It is ordered that Will Steel, Esquire, of Texarkana, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James J. Mayfield, It is ordered that Henry K. Dickinson, Esquire, of Opelika, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. C. Sullivan, It is ordered that Lincoln H. Titus, Esquire, of Kalamazoo, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John P. Bramhall, It is ordered that Ralph G. Barclay, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Riley J. Wilson, It is ordered that Judson M. Grimmet, Esquire, of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chester J. Gerkin, It is ordered that Robert Palmer Ingram, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that George Reily DeBruler, Esquire, of Evansville, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Peyton Gordon, It is ordered that J. H. Bilbrey, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Paul G. Davis, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Taylor E. Groninger, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that George Howard Foster, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James C. Davis, It is ordered that John S. Sprowls, Esquire, of Superior, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. A. McLaughlin, It is ordered that Lyman T. Powell, Esquire, of Superior, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Sperry Oil & Gas Company and Oklahoma Producing & Refining Corporation of America, Appellants,
164. vs.
Pearl Chisholm and Webster Chisholm.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed as to so much of the supplemental instrument, dated March 9, 1914, modifying and extending the oil and gas lease previously executed by the appellee, Webster Chisholm, as covers the fifty acres of his "surplus" allotment of tribal lands, and reversed as to so much thereof as covers the thirty acres of his "homestead" allotment of said lands; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court. One half of the costs in each of the three Courts will be paid by the appellants, and one half thereof by the appellees.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

George R. Meek, Petitioner,
590. vs.
Centre County Banking Company and John M. Shugert, Bankrupts.
Florence F. Dale, Petitioner,
591. vs.
Centre County Banking Company and John M. Shugert, Bankrupts.
Andrew Breeze, Petitioner,
592. vs.
Centre County Banking Company and John M. Shugert, Bankrupts.

On consideration of the suggestions of the death of the respondent, John M. Shugert, and of the motions of the petitioners, George R. Meek, Florence F. Dale and Andrew Breeze, to dismiss as to them individually and as alleged partners in the Centre County Banking Company, the proceedings in bankruptcy instituted by said Shugert in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motions to dismiss be, and the same are hereby, now denied, with leave to any persons claiming to be the proper representatives of said Shugert's interest in the property involved to appear in this Court within thirty days from this date, setting forth the capacity in which they so claim, and applying for leave to be admitted as parties for the purpose of continuing said proceeding.

Notice of this order will be forthwith given to the representatives of said Shugert's interest in the property involved and to not less than three creditors of said Centre County Banking Company, by Samuel D. Gettig, Esquire, and Newton B. Spangler, Esquire, who will, within such thirty days, file with the Clerk of this Court a verified return showing to whom such notices were given.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

The State of Georgia, Complainant,
21, Orig'l. vs.
The City of Chattanooga.

This cause came on to be heard on the bill of complaint and the motion to dismiss the same, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the bill of complaint herein be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs, without prejudice.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Eneas J. McCurdy, County Treasurer, Osage County, Oklahoma; Andrew B. Ludwick, County Clerk, Osage County, Oklahoma; The Board of Commissioners of Osage County, Oklahoma, et al., Appellants,
135. vs.
The United States of America.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Chung Fook, Petitioner,

299. vs.

Edward White, as Commissioner of Immigration for the Port of San Francisco.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The United States of America, Appellant,

240. vs.

Tommy Payne.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The First National Bank of Greeley, Plaintiff in Error,

180. vs.

The Board of County Commissioners of the County of Weld.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Colorado.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Colorado, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs. Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

E. I. DuPont de Nemours & Company, Petitioner,
517. vs.
James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, Agent.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Webster Electric Company, Petitioner,
93. vs.
Splitdorf Electrical Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Taubel-Scott-Kitzmiller Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
188. vs.
David J. Fox, Reginald P. Boyd, and Eugene S. Benjamin, Trustees in Bankruptcy of Cowen Hosiery, Inc., Bankrupt.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Nyanza Steamship Company, Ltd.,
Appellant,
307. vs.
Jahncke Dry Dock No. 1, Jahncke Dry Docks, Inc., et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and

decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction in this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Oliver American Trading Company, Inc.,

Plaintiff in Error,

662. vs.

The Government of the United States of Mexico and National Railways of Mexico.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, transferred to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, pursuant to the Act of Congress of September 14, 1922.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Louisiana Public Service Commission, Huey P. Long, Chairman; Shelby Taylor and Francis Williams, members thereof,

Appellants,

421. vs.

Morgan's Louisiana & Texas Railroad & Steamship Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

William H. Rodman, United States Marshal, Petitioner,

546. vs.

Roland R. Rothier.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Rhode Island for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

James C. Davis, as Agent etc.,
Petitioner,
114. vs.
The Portland Seed Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The San Francisco and Portland Steamship Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
122. vs.
A. J. Parrington.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that

this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

James C. Davis, Agent, United States Railroad Administration,

Plaintiff in Error,

123. vs.

A. J. Parrington.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Great Northern Railway Company,

Petitioner,

209. vs.

McCaull-Dinsmore Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Panama Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
369. vs.
Andrew Johnson.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the Courts of the State of New York; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

Prestonettes, Inc., Petitioner,
197. vs.
Francois Joseph de Spoturno Coty.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that the interlocutory decree of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed, subject to the usual power of that Court upon final hearing; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

James B. Dillingham, as President, et al., etc., et al.,
690. vs.
George V. McLaughlin, as Superintendent of Banks of the State of New York, et al.
George V. McLaughlin, as Superintendent of Banks of the State of New York, et al.,
691. vs.
James B. Dillingham, as President,

Appellants,

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of New York, on appeal and cross-appeal, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed, with costs to be paid by James B. Dillingham, as President, et al., etc., et al.; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. O. J. Nichols. 268.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Mr. Justice McReynolds concurs in the result.

The United States, Appellant, vs. Alphonse Gay. 205.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Clarence D. Keller and Arthur C. Lillie, doing business as Hartford Windshield Company,

Petitioners,

315. vs.

Adams-Campbell Company, Inc.; T. R. Gabel, A. F. Kipper, Individually, and A. F. Kipper, doing business as Kipper & Company, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John E. Thropp's Sons Company,

Petitioner,

185. vs.

Frank A. Seiberling.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey with directions to dismiss the bill.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Railroad Commission of the State of California, Petitioner,

283. vs.

Southern Pacific Company and Southern Pacific Railroad Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Railroad Commission of the State of California, Petitioner,
284. vs.
The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Railroad Commission of the State of California, Petitioner,
285. vs.
Los Angeles & Salt Lake Railroad Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

Ex parte In the matter of Modern Workmen of the World,
——.
Original. Petitioner.

~~The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein~~

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Luckenbach Steamship Company et al.

vs.

Norwegian Barque "Thekla", Her Tackle etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause placed on the summary docket and assigned for argument on Monday, November 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Charles Wolff Packing Company, Plaintiff in Error,

622.
839. vs.

The Court of Industrial Relations of the State of Kansas.

On consideration of the motion to advance thesecauses,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the causes placed on the summary docket and assigned for argument on Monday, November 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. F. Gravins, Petitioner,

570. vs.

Walker D. Hines, Director General of Railroads etc.

On consideration of the motion to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

It is further ordered that the said petitioner be, and he is hereby, granted leave to print the record within two weeks.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. F. Richardson, Jr., Company, Inc., Plaintiff in Error,

603. vs.

Walker D. Hines, Director General etc.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and same is hereby,

dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mayo Milling Company, Inc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
604. vs.
Walker D. Hines, Director General etc.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdictipn.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Adams Grain & Provision Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
605. vs.
Walker D. Hines, Director General etc.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Adams Grain & Provision Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
606. vs.
John Barton Payne, Director Genetal etc.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel Freshman, Petitioner,
840. vs.
W. S. Atkins.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Concrete Appliances Company et al.,
Petitioners,
856. vs.
John E. Gomery et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Clay Cooke, Petitioner,
864. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to

the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

North Carolina Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
879. vs.
C. D. Story, Sheriff of Alamance County, North Carolina, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Nevada State Journal Publishing Company, Petitioner,
804. vs.
Charles B. Henderson.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Verner Hall, Trustee,
Petitioner,
825. vs.
Lynn Reagor, Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Adolph Paleais, Petitioner,
850. vs.
Lewis H. Saper.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

David A. Manville & Company, Inc., Petitioner,
851. vs.
Francis Oil & Refining Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

M. Massel, Jr., Petitioner,
876. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry B. Stiles, Appellant,
830. vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion of the appellant that an order be entered directing the printing of his brief herein at public expense,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, on the ground that the statute does not authorize such action by this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James K. Cochran and Harris Kobey, Plaintiffs in Error,
498, Oct.Term, vs.
1923.
Coulton M. Becker.

On consideration of the motion of the plaintiffs in error herein to revoke the mandate in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

National Paper & Type Company, Plaintiff in Error,
877. vs.
Frank K. Bowers, Collector etc.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf.

Roscoe Irwin, Former Collector etc., Petitioner,
883. vs.
E. Palmer Gavit.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the petitioner, and by Mr. Neile F. Towner for the respondent.

William R. Rodman, United States Marshal, Petitioner,
546. vs.
Roland R. Pothier.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner, the mandate in this cause was granted.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
559. vs.
Ninety-five Barrels, more or less, Alleged Apple Cider Vinegar, et al.

On motion of Mr. Judson Harmon in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

~~The United State~~

The United States of America et al., Appellants,
333. vs.
Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

On motion of Mr. C. R. Hillyer in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

Supreme Lodge, Knights of Pythias, Plaintiff in Error,
214. vs.
George O. Meyer.

On motion of Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage in that behalf, leave was granted to file an additional brief herein for the plaintiff in error.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, Petitioner,
913. vs.
William Redford Coyle, Trustee etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Evan Shelby for the petitioner, and by Mr. Emory R. Buckner for the respondent.

Ex parte In the matter of William A. Higgins et al.,
Orig'l. Petitioners.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Mark Stearman and Mr. Emanuel J. Myers for the petitioners.

~~John H. Ford vs. Guy Sturgis, Administrator etc.~~
John H. Ford
793. vs.
Guy Sturgis, Administrator etc.
Union Iron Works Company
794. vs.
Guy Sturgis, Administrator etc.
Reginald W. Geare
795. vs.
Guy Sturgis, Administrator etc.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joe V. Morgan in that behalf.

The Michigan Public Utilities Commission et al., Appellants,
805. vs.
Coral W. Duke, doing business as Duke Cartage Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. C. Sullivan in that behalf.

Flo La Chapelle, as Administratrix etc., Plaintiff in Error,
735. vs.
Union Pacific Coal Company.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Bates in behalf of Mr. H. H. Loomis and Mr. John W. Lacey for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. John A. Shelton for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Behn, Meyer & Company, Limited, Appellant,
921. vs.
Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian of the United States, et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Bradley in that behalf.

Greensboro Warehouse & Storage Company. Petitioner,
894. vs.
James C. Davis, Director General etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank P. Hobgood, Jr., Mr. William P. Bynum, and Mr. Sidney S. Alderman for the petitioner.

James C. Davis, Agent etc.,
640. vs.
Dexter & Carpenter, Inc.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Otto Schlobohm and Mr. William B. Symmes, Jr., for Dexter & Carpenter, Inc., in support of the motion, and by Mr. Duncan K. Brent in opposition thereto.

Hygrade Provision Company, Inc., et al., Appellants,
403. vs.
Carl Sherman, Attorney General etc., et al.

Lewis & Fox Company, Appellant,
404. vs.
Carl Sherman, Attorney General etc., et al.

Harry Satz, Appellant,
405. vs.
Carl Sherman, Attorney General etc., et al.

This cause was reassigned for argument on Monday, November 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day, on motion of Mr. D. L. Podell in that behalf.

The United States, Appellant,
447. vs.
The Supplee-Biddle Hardware Co.

On motion of Mr. Henry Mecarsulmer in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

Alpha Portland Cement Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Commonwealth of Massachusetts. 402. 888.

The motion to consolidate and advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. C. Taylor in that behalf.

Ex parte In the matter of A. A. Sander, ——. Original. Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash for the petitioner.

Herman A. Wagner, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of Milwaukee et al. 531.

The joint motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leon B. Lamfrom for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. John M. Niven and Mr. Charles W. Babcock for the defendants in error.

The State of New Mexico, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas. 3, Orig'l.

The motion for leave to take additional testimony in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. R. Prince in behalf of the Attorney General of New Mexico.

Ex parte In the matter of the Government of the Republic of Portugal et al.,- ——, Orig'l. - Petitioners.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. Dudley Kohler for the petitioners.

Thomas Joyce, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 831.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Marshall B. Woodworth for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

William F. Quesse et al.,
Petitioners,
838. vs.
The People of the State of Illinois.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Willard M. McEwen for the petitioners.

Charles E. Schaff, as Receiver of the Properties of the Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Company,
Petitioner,
853. vs.
S. H. Hudgins et al., Copartners etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander Britton, Mr. Joseph M. Bryson, Mr. Maurice D. Green, and Mr. Charles S. Burg for the petitioner, and by Mr. Bird McGuire for the respondent.

J. W. Ward Farming Company et al.,
Petitioners,
854. vs.
W. E. Lowry et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. B. Lewright for the petitioners, and by Mr. A. J. Brooks for the respondents.

Modern Woodmen of America,
Petitioner,
861. vs.
Jennie Vida Mixer.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nelson C. Pratt for the petitioner.

Robins Dry Dock & Repair Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
870. vs.
Lars Dahl.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. G. Maul for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition, and by Mr. Ralph G. Barclay for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

E. W. Clark & Company, Petitioner,
874. vs.
Augusta M. Slaymaker et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals, Franklin County, State of Ohio, was submit-

White and Mr. Talfourd P. Linn for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward C. Turner, Mr. Albert M. Calland, Mr. F. S. Monnett, and Mr. David F. Pugh for the respondents.

Iver Olbers, Petitioner,
875. vs.
United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Silas B. Axtell for the petitioner, and by Mr. George H. Emerson and Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper for the respondents.

Raleigh Monroe Falconer,
Petitioner,
882. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuitwas submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ivan L. Hyland for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

The E. Ingraham Company, Petitioner,
884. vs.
Ida Silver, doing business under the firm name and style of The Ideal Crystal & Machine Manufacturing Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. O. Ellery Edwards for the petitioner.

J. L. McDaniel (first name unknown),
Petitioner,
885. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert R. Nevin and Mr. Earl H. Turner for the petitioner.

Chicago and Northwestern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
887. vs.
Alvin R. Durham Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert H. Widdicombe and Mr. R. N. Van Doren for the petitioner, and by Mr. Julius J. Patik for the respondents.

John E. Winkelman, Petitioner,
889. vs.
Laura M. Winkelman.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John E. Hughes for the petitioner.

Southern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
893. vs.
Margaret E. Kirkland et al., as Executors etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. R. Prince, Mr. H. O'B. Cooper, Mr. F. G. Tompkins, and Mr. L. E. Jeffries for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. S. Harby for the respondents.

Jules Arnstein, alias Mickey Arnstein, et al.,
Petitioners,
895. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry E. Davis and Mr. T. Morris Wampler for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Peyton Gordon, and Mr. William E. Leahy for the respondent.

Panama Railroad Company, Petitioner,
896. vs.
Old Dominion Transportation Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Richard Reid Rogers for the petitioner, and by Mr. Leon T. Seawell for the respondent.

John Randolph et al., Administrators etc.,
Petitioners,
897. vs.
Bouker Contracting Company, as Owner of Scow 84-H.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Herman S. Hertwig for the petitioners, and by Mr. George V. A. McCloskey for the respondent.

John Cook, Administrator of Benjamin F. Dyson, etc., Petitioner,
904. vs.
Washington, Baltimore & Annapolis Electric Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Wethered Barroll for the petitioner.

Joe Wigington, Petitioner,
907. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert H. Talley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

F. P. Burton, Trustee etc., et al., Petitioners,
908. vs.
J. D. Weatherman.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel A. Anderson for the petitioners.

T. R. Bennett, Superintendent of Banks for the State of Georgia, Petitioner,
909. vs.
John E. Schwarz et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Paul E. Seabrook for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. Wiley Johnson for the respondents.

Detroit Carrier & Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
914. vs.
John G. Perrin.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Melville Church for the petitioner, and by Mr. Albert M. Austin for the respondent.

Leon Sigman, Petitioner,
916. vs.
Mabel G. Reinecke, Individually and as Collector of Internal Revenue etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the

Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. M. Sternhagen and Mr. Arnold R. Baar for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the respondent.

The United States of America ex rel. Hyman Patton, next friend and father of Pola Patton, an infant,
Petitioner,
917. vs.
Robert E. Tod, as Commissioner of Immigration of the Port of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. S. Gilbert for the petitioner.

C. E. Bulloch et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
194. vs.
Dermott-Collins Road Improvement District et al.

The return of the plaintiffs in error herein to the rule to show cause was submitted.

Southeastern Express Company,
Appellant,
216. vs.
W. J. Miller, State Revenue Agent, et al.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Sanders McDaniel and Mr. A. S. Bozeman for the appellant, and by Mr. H. H. Thompson for the appellee.

Flo La Chapelle, as Administratrix of the Estate of Peter Poumakis, deceased, Plaintiff in Error,
735. vs.
Union Pacific Coal Company.

This cause was submitted by Mr. John A. Shelton for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. N. H. Loomis and Mr. John W. Lacey for the defendant in error.

The State of Michigan, Complainant,
25, Orig'l. vs.
The State of Wisconsin.

The argument on the motion to dismiss in this cause was commenced by Mr. Robert M. Rieser for the defendant in support of the motion. The hearing was suspended. The further consideration of the motion was postponed until the cause is reached on the merits.

Liang Sung Wan, Petitioner,

451. vs.

The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William C. Dennis for the petitioner.

Joseph Radice, Plaintiff in Error,

176. vs.

The People of the State of New York.

It is ordered by this Court that the words "find reasonable grounds for a contrary opinion", in lines 10 and 11 from bottom of page 2 of the printed opinion heretofore filed herein, be, and the same are hereby, stricken out; and that the words "say that the finding is clearly unfounded", be, and the same are hereby, substituted therefor.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Vernon E. Hodges, It is ordered that T. B. Merchant, Esquire, of Binghamton, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Adrian C. Humphrey, It is ordered that Scott F. Evans, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fritz G. Lanham, It is ordered that Harry C. Weeks, Esquire, of Wichita Falls, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. A. Wheat, It is ordered that William W. Armstrong, Esquire, of Rochester, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William M. Hastings, It is ordered that Arthur D. Honnold, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of New Mexico, Complainant,
14, Orig'l. vs.
The State of Colorado.

On motion of Mr. Clyde C. Dawson in behalf of Mr. Wayne C. Williams, Mr. Charles Roach, Mr. Oliver Dean, and Mr. Delph E. Carpenter for the defendant, leave was granted to file an amended answer and cross-bill herein.

Ziang Sung Wan, Petitioner,
451. vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Peyton Gordon for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for the petitioner.

The United States, Appellant,
217. vs.
Charles J. Ferris.

This cause was argued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the appellant, and by Mr. George A. King for the appellee.

The United States, Appellant,
218. vs.
John Valante.

This cause was argued by Mr. George Ross Hull for the appellant, and submitted by Mr. Abner Siegal for the appellee.

The City of Opelika, Appellant,
524. vs.
Opelika Sewer Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. J. J. Mayfield for the appellant, and continued by Mr. William Findlay Brown for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Frank Davis, Jr., It is ordered that Fannie Bear Besser, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry E. Mattison, It is ordered that Benjamin J. Jarrett, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry E. Mattison, It is ordered that John G. Frazer, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. W. Maupin, It is ordered that John U. Gardiner, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. A. Wheat, It is ordered that Arthur J. Westermayr, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. Cabell Bruce, It is ordered that Washington Bowie, Jr., Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Phil D. Swing, It is ordered that Bradford M. Melvin, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The City of Opelika, Appellant,
524. vs.
Opelika Sewer Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. William Findlay Brown for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. J. J. Mayfield for the appellant.

The United States, Appellant,
447. vs.
The Supplee-Biddle Hardware Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the appellant, continued by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., and Mr. Frederic L. Clark for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the appellant.

Sam Michaelson et al., Petitioners,
708. vs.
The United States.

S. C. Sandefur
679. vs.
Canoe Creek Coal Company.

Three hours were allowed for the argument of these cases.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. D. R. Richberg for the petitioners in No. 708, and continued by Mr. James W. Henson for S. C. Sandefur in No. 679, by Mr. Edward Porter Humphrey for Canoe Creek Coal Company in No. 679, and by Mr. Richard L. Kennedy for the respondent in No. 708.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow

THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justice.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Ross Hull, It is ordered that William J. Griffin, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward E. Browne, It is ordered that Frank W. Lucas, Esquire, of Madison, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Ross Hull, It is ordered that Oscar C. Hull, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Ross Hull, It is ordered that Milo H. Crawford, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Ross Hull, It is ordered that William J. Belknap, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl E. Mapes, It is ordered that Ralph . E. Routier, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Gordon M. Buck, It is ordered that Raymond J. Scully, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Bruce Scott, It is ordered that Jesse L. Root, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur W. Kilpatrick, It is ordered that Noble T. Lawson, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Sam Michaelson et al., Petitioners,

708. vs.

The United States ex rel. Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Railway Company.

S. C. Sandefur

679. vs.

Cance Creek Coal Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Richard L. Kennedy for the respondent in No. 708, and concluded by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston for the petitioners in No. 708 and S. C. Sandefur in No. 679.

Wong Doo, Petitioner,

736. vs.

The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William J. Dawley for the petitioner, continued by Mr. George Ross Hull for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Jackson H.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, etc., Petitioner,

757. vs.

Timothy Donovan, as Owner of the Deck Scow "Mary Ethel", et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Evan Shelby for the petitioner, and by Mr. George V. A. McCloskey for the respondents.

The United States of America, Petitioner,

559. vs.

Ninety-five Barrels, (more or less), Alleged Apple Cider Vinegar, et al.

On motion of Mr. William W. Armstrong in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. James A. Fowler for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, APRIL 11, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred H. Dominick, It is ordered that A. C. Arnold, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred H. Dominick, It is ordered that Ray B. Barnett, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Townsend, It is ordered that Thomas G. Steward, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard P. Whiteley, It is ordered that Benjamin Reass, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard P. Whiteley, It is ordered that Emanuel Newman, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Marvin Jones, It is ordered that John D. McCall, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Cox, It is ordered that Edward Harding, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

J. C. Walton, Appellant,

689. vs.

The House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma et al.

The motion to continue this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. R. Serven in that behalf; and the motion was denied.

Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company, Appellant,

224. vs.

W. H. Osborne, Jr., Tax Commissioner etc., et al.

Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Railway Company, Appellant,

225. vs.

W. H. Osborne, Jr., Tax Commissioner etc.

These cases were consolidated and advanced, to be heard with case No. 219, on motion of Mr. R. N. Van Doren for the appellants.

The United States of America, Petitioner,

559. vs.

Ninety-five Barrels (more or less), Alleged Apple Cider Vinegar et al.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. L. C. Spieth for the respondents.

The State of Missouri ex rel. The Burns National Bank of St. Joseph,
Plaintiff in Error,
762. vs.
A. B. Duncan, Judge of the Probate Court of Buchanan County, Missouri.

This cause was argued by Mr. J. D. Bowersock for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for The United States, as amicus curiae; and submitted by Mr. Morton Jourdan and Mr. Charles H. Mayer for the defendant in error.

J. C. Walton, Appellant,
689. vs.
The House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma et al.

This cause was submitted by Mr. George F. Short for the appellees, with leave to counsel for the appellant to file a brief herein within fifteen days.

Continental and Commercial Trust and Savings Bank,
Plaintiff in Error,
504. vs.
Wilhelmina Werner et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. E. A. Walters for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. W. G. Bissell for the defendants in error.

The Idaho Irrigation Company, Limited, et al.,
Appellants,
324. vs.
Fred W. Gooding et al.

Fred W. Gooding et al., Appellants,
336. vs.
The Idaho Irrigation Company, Limited, et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Gordon M. Buck for the appellants in No. 324 and the appellees in No. 336, and continued by Mr. Harrison Tweed for the Equitable Trust Company of New York et al.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, APRIL 14, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Denworth, It is ordered that C. H. Poe, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis Marshall, It is ordered that J. George Silberstein, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis Marshall, It is ordered that James Marshall, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Bird J. Vincent, It is ordered that Harvey A. Penney, Esquire, of Saginaw, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. L. Cole, It is ordered that Mat J. Holland, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. B. Rose, It is ordered that Arthur T. Brewster, Esquire, of Ironton, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John H. Dunbar, It is ordered that E. K. Murray, Esquire, of Tacoma, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John H. Dunbar, It is ordered that Thomas J. L. Kennedy, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis Marshall, It is ordered that James A. Gray, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. W. Bradford, It is ordered that Frank B. Goudy, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. O. Stanley, It is ordered that Stanley Reed, Esquire, of Maysville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John H. Dunbar, It is ordered that Alex M. Winston, Esquire, of Spokane, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. P. H. Odom, It is ordered that John J. Cannon, Esquire, of Palatka, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom D. McKeown, It is ordered that Charles L. Orr, Esquire, of Holdenville, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert H. Lovett, It is ordered that Charles B. Matthews Nash, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Ernest G. Metcalfe, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Randolph W. Branch, Esquire, of Manchester, State of New Hampshire, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis Marshall, It is ordered that Joseph P. Reilly, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Jay Burns Baking Company, Petersen and Pegau Baking Company, Federal System of Bakeries of Omaha, et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Charles W. Bryan, as Governor of the State of Nebraska, et al., etc. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

94.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Brandeis,
Mr. Justice Holmes.

Ex parte In the matter of William A. Higgins, Petitioner. — On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein,

Original.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of A. A. Sander, Petitioner. — On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein,

Original.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of New Mexico, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas. — On consideration of the motion of The State of New Mexico for leave to take additional testimony of the witness R. J. Owen in this cause,

3, Orig'l.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, to be limited to the subject matter detailed

in his affidavits, dated November 26th, 1923, and filed with the motion, his examination and cross-examination to be completed within the month of May, with the right on the part of the State of Texas to introduce rebuttal to Owen's testimony during the month of June; New Mexico to pay all the costs of the additional testimony, both that of Owen and of witnesses called in rebuttal to his evidence.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of the Republic of Portugal,
—.
Original. Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

National Paper & Type Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
877. vs.
Frank K. Bowers, Collector etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John H. Ford
793. vs.
Guy Sturgis, Administrator etc.

Union Iron Works Company
794. vs.
Guy Sturgis, Administrator etc.

Reginald W. Geare
795. vs.
Guy Sturgis, Administrator etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance these causes,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the causes assigned for argument on Monday, November 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Herman A. Wagner,
Plaintiff in Error,
531. vs.
The City of Milwaukee et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause placed on the summary docket and assigned

for argument on Monday, November 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Michigan Public Utilities Commission et al., Appellants,
805. vs.
Coral W. Duke, doing business as Duke Cartage Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,
It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause placed on the summary docket and assigned for argument on Monday, November 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Behn, Meyer & Company, Limited, Appellant,
921. vs.
Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian of the United States, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,
It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause placed on the summary docket and assigned for argument on Monday, November 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alpha Port Cement Company,
402.
888. vs.
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,
It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Roscoe Irwin, Former Collector etc., Petitioner,
883. vs.
E. Palmer Gavit.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Joselyn Tiger, Plaintiff in Error, 729. vs. Aaron Drumright et al. On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas Joyce, Petitioner, 831. vs. The United States of America. On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. W. Ward Farming Company et al., etc., Petitioners, 854. vs. W. E. Lowry et al. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. W. Clark & Company, Petitioner, 874. vs. Augusta M. Slaymaker et al. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of Franklin County, State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of Franklin County, State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Iver Olbers, Petitioner,

875. vs.

United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Raleigh Monroe Falconer, Petitioner,

882. vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The E. Ingraham Company,
Petitioner,

884. vs.

Ida Silver, doing business under the firm name and style of The Ideal Crystal & Machine Manufacturing Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. L. MacDaniel (first name unknown),
Petitioner,

885. vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein

to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John E. Winkelman, Petitioner,
889. vs.
Laura M. Winkelman.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
893. vs.
Margaret E. Kirkland et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the SupremeCourt of the State of South Carolina, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Greensboro Warehouse & Storage Company, Petitioner,
894. vs.
James C. Davis, Director General etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Flo LaChapelle, as Administratrix of the Estate of Peter Foumakis, deceased,

Plaintiff in Error,

735. vs.

Union Pacific Coal Company.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Wyoming.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wyoming, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Agent etc.,

Plaintiff in Error,

640. vs.

Dexter & Carpenter, Inc.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, transferred to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit pursuant to the Act of Congress of September 14, 1922.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Continental & Commercial Trust & Savings Bank, Plaintiff in Error,

504. vs.

Wilhelmina Werner et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Complainant,
—,
Orig'l. vs.
The State of Wisconsin.

The motion for leave to file bill of complaint herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the complainant.

The City of Newark et al.,
Appellants,
933. vs.
The Central Railroad Company of New Jersey et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George W. Wickersham in that behalf.

Bass, Ratcliff & Gretton, Limited,
Plaintiff in Error,
24. vs.
State Tax Commission.

Gorham Manufacturing Company,
Appellant,
14. vs.
State Tax Commission of the State of New York et al.

On motion of Mr. Ernest G. Metcalfe in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

James C. Davis, Director General etc.,
Petitioner,
819. vs.
Corona Coal Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Denegre, Mr. Victor Leovy, and Mr. Henry H. Chaffe in that behalf.

The People of the State of New York ex rel. Rosevale Realty Company, Inc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
931. vs.
Albert E. Kleinert, as Superintendent of the Bureau of Buildings of the Borough of Brooklyn, Inc., et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. A. Whiteley in that behalf.

In the matter of the petition of East River Towing Company, Inc., for Limitation of Liability of the Steam Tug "Edward", her engines, etc.
359.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. P. Gray in that behalf.

The Sanitary District of Chicago, Appellant, vs. The United States of America. 529.

On motion of Mr. C. S. Ferris in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

Eastman Kodak Company of New York, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Southern Photo Materials Company. 781.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Davis, Mr. Alex. W. Smith, Mr. Frank L. Crawford, and Mr. Clarence P. Moser for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition, and by Mr. Daniel McDougald for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Reynolds-Davis Grocery Company. 891.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Vincent M. Miles and Mr. Thomas B. Pryor for the petitioner.

Southern Utilities Company, Petitioner, vs. The City of Palatka. 915.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. T. G. Crawford and Mr. W. B. Crawford for the petitioner, and by Mr. P. H. Odom for the respondent.

W. & A. Fletcher Company, Petitioner, vs. International Mercantile Marine Company. 926.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ira A. Campbell, Mr. John M. Woolsey, and Mr. Clarence Bishop Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles C. Burlingham, Mr. Chauncey I. Clark, and Mr. Ray Rood Allen for the respondent.

Crawford County Levee and Drainage District No. 1, Petitioner, vs. J. R. Hutson et al. 948.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin was

submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles E. Buell and Mr. Frank W. Lucas for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harry L. Butler for the respondent.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,
432. vs.
Garfield Ladner.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. J. Gex for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Gregory L. Smith for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Santa Clara Valley Land Company, Plaintiff in Error,
763. vs.
Arthur Meehan, as City Marshal etc., et al.

In Error to the District Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, of the State of California.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

THEREFORE, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sol D. Snitow, Petitioner,
842. vs.
Harry L. Wissing, Trustee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein has been filed.

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, per stipulation.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Idaho Irrigation Company, Limited, et al.,
Petitioners,
324. vs.
Fred W. Gooding et al.

Fred W. Gooding et al., Petitioners,
336. vs.
The Idaho Irrigation Company, Limited, et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Harrison Tweed for Idaho Irrigation Company, Limited, and concluded by Mr. W. G. Bissell for Fred W. Gooding et al.

Ex parte In the matter of Skinner & Eddy Corporation,
28.
Original. Petitioner.

This cause was argued on the return to the rule to show cause by Mr. Louis Titus and Mr. George Donworth for the petitioner, and by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the respondents.

Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company,
Appellant,
219. vs.
W. H. Osborne, etc., et al.

Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company,
Appellant,
224. vs.
W. H. Osborne, Jr., Tax Commissioner etc., et al.

Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Railway Company,
Appellant,
225. vs.
W. H. Osborne, Jr., Tax Commissioner etc., et al.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Bruce Scott for the appellant in No. 219.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, APRIL 15, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter S. Penfield, It is ordered that Benjamin S. Pagel, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, It is ordered that Joseph Michelman, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William S. Hammers, It is ordered that Joseph W. Kimbel, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced that there will be no session of the Court on the 18th instant.

Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company, Appellant,
219. vs.
W. H. Osborne, Tax Commissioner etc., et al.

Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company, Appellant,
224. vs.
W. H. Osborne, Jr., Tax Commissioner etc., et al.

Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Railway Company, Appellant,
225. vs.
W. H. Osborne, Jr., Tax Commissioner etc., et al.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Wymer Dressler for the appellants in Nos. 224 and 225, by Mr. George W. Ayres and Mr. Hugh LaMaster for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Bruce Scott for the appellant in No. 219.

George W. Cook, Plaintiff in Error,
220. vs.
Galen L. Tait, United States Collector etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Charles Claflin Allen, Jr., for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Charles Claflin Allen for the plaintiff in error.

Commissioner of Immigration of the Port of New York,
Petitioner,
221. vs.
Gittel Gottlieb et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. George Ross Hull for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 16, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Ross Hull, It is ordered that Douglass D. Storey, Esquire, of Harrisburg, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage, It is ordered that Lennard H. Mitchell, Esquire, of Newcastle, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred L. Geiger, It is ordered that Clarence B. Randall, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard J. Higgins, It is ordered that Robert D. Garver, Esquire, of Bartlesville, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred S. Jackson, It is ordered that Maurice Murphy, Esquire, of Topeka, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred L. Geiger, It is ordered that Samuel Brenner, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of New Mexico, Complainant,
14, Orig'l. vs.
The State of Colorado.

On motion of Mr. A. A. Jones in that behalf, leave was granted to file replication and answer to the cross bill.

The United States, Appellant,
227. vs.
James Reed.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellant, and by Mr. George A. King for the appellee.

Commissioner of Immigration of the Port of New York, Petitioner,
221. vs.
Gittel Gottleib et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. George Ross Hull for the petitioner, and by Mr. Louis Marshall for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. George Ross Hull for the petitioner.

A. P. Kennedy et al.
222. vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. James Patrick Gilmore for A. P. Kennedy et al., and by Assistant Attorney Willebrandt for The United States.

The United States of America, etc., Appellant,
666. vs.
American Railway Express Company.

Southeastern Express Company, Appellant,
667. vs.
American Railway Express Company et al.

Southern Traffic League et al., Appellants,
668, vs.
American Railway Express Company et al.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for The United States, and continued by Mr. R. C. Alston for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, APRIL 17, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Vandevanter,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Walter B. Walker, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, It is ordered that John J. Boyle, Esquire, of Youngstown, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Holden Tinkham, It is ordered that William J. Drew, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur M. Free, It is ordered that J. D. Fredericks, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur M. Free, It is ordered that Samuel W. Odell, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Claude T. Dawes, It is ordered that M. Vincent Ryan, Esquire, of Albany, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi Cooke, It is ordered that Earl F. Reed, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Wilbur Reed Seabrook, Esquire, of Erie, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America et al.,
Appellants,
229. vs.
The City of Wellsville, Ohio.

On motion of Mr. Harry Brokaw in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief for The City of East Liverpool, Ohio, as amicus curiae herein.

The United States of America et al.,
Appellants,
666. vs.
American Railway Express Company et al.
Southeastern Express Company,
Appellant,
667. vs.
American Railway Express Company.
Southern Traffic League et al.,
Appellants,
668. vs.
American Railway Express Company et al.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Robert C. Alston for the appellees, by Mr. P. J. Farrell for the Interstate Commerce Commission, by Mr. T. M. Cunningham, Jr., for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Sanders McDaniel for the Southeastern Express Company.

The Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Company, Appellant,
789. vs.
E. V. Kuykendall, etc.

The Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Company, Appellant,
540. vs.
E. V. Kuykendall, etc.

The Home Telephone & Telegraph Company of Spokane, Appellant,
790. vs.
E. V. Kuykendall, etc.

The Home Telephone & Telegraph Company of Spokane, Appellant,
539. vs.
E. V. Kuykendall, etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Otto B. Rupp for the appellants, continued by Mr. John H. Dunbar, Mr. T. J. L. Kennedy, and Mr. Alexander M. Winston for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Otto B. Rupp for the appellants.

William R. Warner & Company, Petitioner,
32. vs.
Eli Lilly & Company.

This cause was passed per stipulation of counsel, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9 of Rule 26.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, APRIL 21, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas R. Rutter, It is ordered that Morris E. Kinnan, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer, It is ordered that Jacob M. Friedlander, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Andrew J. Peters, It is ordered that E. Mark Sullivan, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Andrew J. Peters, It is ordered that Samuel Silverman, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, It is ordered that Clay Judson, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. Marquette, It is ordered that Percy A. Wells, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that Harold T. Edwards, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otis Wingo, It is ordered that C. A. Starbird, Esquire, of Alma, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James W. Carmalt, It is ordered that W. H. T. Loyall, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Mr. Solicitor General Beck presented the Honorable Harlan F. Stone, Attorney General of the United States, and it was ordered that his Commission be recorded; which Commission is in the following words, viz:

CALVIN COOLIDGE,

President of the United States of America,

To all who shall see these presents, Greeting:

Know ye, that reposing special trust and confidence in the Patriotism, Integrity and Abilities of Harlan F. Stone, of New York, I have nominated, and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, do appoint him Attorney General, and do authorize and empower him to execute and fulfil the duties of that Office according to law, and to have and to hold the said Office, with all the powers, privileges and emoluments to the same

of right appertaining, unto him the said Harlan F. Stone, during the pleasure of the President of the United States, for the time being.

In testimony whereof, I have caused these Letters to be made Patent, and the Seal of the United States to be hereunto affixed.

Done at the City of Washington this seventh day of April, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and twenty-four,--and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-eighth.

(SEAL). (Signed) CALVIN COOLIDGE.

By the President:

(Signed) CHARLES E. HUGHES,

Secretary of State.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
218. vs.
John Valante.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with instructions to vacate its order of October 31st, 1922, discharge the writ of habeas corpus, and remand the appellee Valante to the custody of the Warden of the City Prison, City of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

James C. Davis, as Agent of the President of the United States under the Transportation Act of 1920,
Petitioner,
297. vs.
R. L. Cornwell.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record

from the Supreme Court of the State of Montana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

W. H. Hoffman, D. A. Kelley, Robert H. Rogers, et al.,

Appellants,

190. vs.

Peter McClelland, Jr., J. M. McCormick, F. M. Etheridge, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas; transferred from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas; transferred from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The Chastleton Corporation and Felix Lake and Claude H. Hahn,

Appellants,

467. vs.

A. Leftwich Sinclair, Clara Sears Taylor, and William F. Gude, Rent Commission of the District of Columbia, et al.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Southeastern Express Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
201. vs.
W. J. Miller, State Revenue Agent.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the Courts of the State of Mississippi.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Southeastern Express Company,
Appellant,
216. vs.
W. J. Miller, State Revenue Agent etc., et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

The United States, Complainant,
Orig'l. vs.
The State of Wisconsin.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and process is ordered to issue returnable on Monday, October 6, 1924.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The City of Newark et al.,
Appellants,
933. vs.
The Central Railroad Company of New Jersey et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

In the matter of petition of East River Towing Company, Inc., for Limitation of Liability of the Steam Tug "Edward", Her Engines etc.
359.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,
IT IS NOW HERE ORDERED by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Director General etc.,
Petitioner,
819. vs.
Corona Coal Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,
It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, May 5th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The People of the State of New York ex rel. Rosevale Realty
Plaintiff in Error,
931. vs.
Albert E. Kleinert, as Superintendent of the Bureau of Buildings of the Borough of Brooklyn, etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
432. vs.
Garfield Ladner.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the Courts of the State of Mississippi.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Prince Tyner, Plaintiff in Error,
697. vs.
Henry Buffington et al.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Railway Express Company,
Petitioner,
778. vs.
The Commonwealth of Kentucky.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel. Hyman Patton, etc.,
Petitioner,
917. vs.
Robert E. Tod, as Commissioner of Immigration.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit

to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Utilities Company,
Petitioner,
915. vs.
The City of Palatka.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wilson Clinton, an incompetent, by Edmond Hill, his next friend and guardian, et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
739. vs.
Gypsy Oil Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Herschell Norman, Petitioner,
826. vs.
The State of Ohio.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles E. Schaff, as Receiver of the Properties of the Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Company,
Petitioner,
853. vs.
S. H. Hudgins et al., Copartners etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jules Arnstein, alias Nickey Arnstein, et al.,
Petitioners,
895. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Panama Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
896. vs.
Old Dominion Transportation Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Randolph, Administrator etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
897. vs.
Bowker Contracting Company, as

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Cook, Administrator of Benjamin F. Dyson, etc., Petitioner,
904. vs.
The Washington, Baltimore & Annapolis Electric Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joe Wigington, Petitioner,
907. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

F. P. Burton, Trustee etc., et al., Petitioners,
908. vs.
J. D. Weatherman.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, Petitioner,
913. vs.
William Radford Coyle, Trustee etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Detroit Carrier & Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
914. vs.
John G. Perrin.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Leon Sigman, Petitioner,
916. vs.
Mabel G. Reinecke, etc., Collector etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Eastman Kodak Company of New York, Plaintiff in Error,
781. vs.
Southern Photo Materials Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. AND A. Fletcher Company, Petitioner,
926. vs.
International Mercantile Marine Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Crawford County Levee and Drainage District No. 1, Petitioner,
948. vs.
J. R. Hutson et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. J. Buck, Appellant,
924. vs.
E. V. Kuykendall, Director of Public Works of the State of Washington.

The motion for a stay herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Merrill Moores in that behalf.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Petitioner,
957. vs.
Robert E. Morrill, Sr.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. P. McIntyre, Mr. E. Perry Thomas, and Mr. George W. Jones for the petitioner, and by Mr. William M. Williams for the respondent.

The Facer Forged Steel Car Wheel & Locomotive Wheel Company, Petitioner,
937. vs.
Carnegie Steel Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles E. Townsend, Mr. Joseph R. Edson, and Mr. Thomas G. Steward for the petitioner, and by Mr. D. Anthony Usina for the respondent.

Daisy M. Scott et al., Petitioners,
906. vs.
The City of Columbus, Ohio.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Timothy S. Hogan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles A. Leach for the respondent.

Prairie Oil & Gas Company, Petitioner,
910. vs.
Louis F. Shanblum et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. S. Arnold for the petitioner.

Patrick McGovern et al., etc., Petitioner,
918. vs.
The City of Boston.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John F. Cronan for the petitioners, and by Mr. E. Mark Sullivan and Mr. Samuel Silverman for the respondent.

New Creek Company, Petitioner,

923. vs.

Ephraim Lederer, Collector.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Wilson Bayard for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Kawasaki Zosensho, Owner of the Steamship "Baltimore Maru",

Petitioner,

935. vs.

Cosulich Societa Triestina Di Navigazione of Trieste, Italy, Owner of Steamship "Anna".

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Whitfield Betts, Jr., Mr. George S. Sprague, and Mr. H. C. Hughes for the petitioner.

The Hettrick Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,

936. vs.

James A. Shepherd & Company, Limited.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Roscoe Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles H. Brady for the respondent.

Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Railway Company et al.,

Petitioners,

943. vs.

Josephine C. Zepler.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wymer Dressler and Mr. R. L. Kennedy for the petitioners, and by Mr. Edward P. Smith and Mr. Francis S. Howell for the respondent.

William A. Brown & Company et al.,

Petitioners,

946. vs.

The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs Appeals was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. B. A. Levett and Mr. Allan R. Brown for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Hoppin for the respondent.

Nancy Roberts et al., Petitioners,
949. vs.
Atlantic Oil Producing Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harvey Riddell for the petitioners.

The New York Central Railroad Company, Petitioner,
950. vs.
Joseph C. Dunbar.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles C. Paulding for the petitioner, and by Mr. John B. Rogers for the respondent.

Alfred Emerson et al., Petitioners,
955. vs.
Radio Corporation of America et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel H. Wandell for the petitioners, and by Mr. L. F. H. Betts for the respondents.

The United States of America ex rel. Dong Yick Yuen,
Petitioner,
961. vs.
John F. Dunton, Chinese Inspector in Charge, Port of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roger O'Donnell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. George Ross Hull for the respondent.

Gorham Manufacturing Company,
Appellant,
14. vs.
State Tax Commission of the State of New York et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. James M. Beck for the appellant, and submitted by Mr. Carl Sherman and Mr. C. T. Dawes for the appellees.

Bass, Ratcliff & Gretton, Limited,
Plaintiff in Error,
24. vs.
State Tax Commission.

This cause was argued by Mr. James M. Beck for the plaintiff in error, and submitted by Mr. Carl Sherman and Mr. C. T. Dawes for the defendant in error.

The State of Missouri ex rel. Jesse W. Barrett, Attorney General, et al., Appellants,

155. vs.

Kansas Natural Gas Company.

The Kansas Natural Gas Company, Plaintiff in Error,

133. vs.

The State of Kansas ex rel. A. M. Helm, Attorney etc.

The State of Kansas ex rel. Fred S. Jackson, Attorney, etc., Appellant,

137. vs.

The Central Trust Company of New York.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. J. W. Dana for the Kansas City Gas Company, continued by Mr. Frank E. Atwood for the State of Missouri and Public Service Commission, by Mr. Robert D. Garver for the Kansas Natural Gas Company, and concluded by Mr. F. S. Jackson for the State of Kansas ex rel. A.M. Helm, attorney for the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Kansas.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, APRIL 22, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry St. George Tucker, It is ordered that James A. Bear, Esquire, of Roanoke, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was admitted to practice.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry St. George Tucker, It is ordered that Henry B. Apperson, Esquire, of Roanoke, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry W. Hill, It is ordered that Francis E. Bagot, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward C. Little, It is ordered that Frank B. Dodds, Esquire, of Lawrence, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry W. Hill, It is ordered that William H. Gorman, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. W. Hastings, It is ordered that Lafayette Walker, Esquire, of Okmulgee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John K. Shields, It is ordered that John S. Daniel, Esquire, of Clarksville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sylvester L. McLaurin, It is ordered that Jesse J. Bruce, Esquire, of Muskogee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sylvester L. McLaurin, It is ordered that J. Bernard Smith, Esquire, of Muskogee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, It is ordered that Daniel Bartlett, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Merlin W. Hixon, Plaintiff in Error,
420. vs.
Louis D. Oakes.

On motion of Mr. E. C. Brokmeyer in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief herein of National Association of Retail Druggists as amicus curiae.

Henry D. Owens, Appellant,
235. vs.
The United States.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Horace S. Whitman and Mr. William L. Marbury for the appellant, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Ottinger for the appellee.

The Bromwell Brush and Wire Goods Company, Plaintiff in Error,
236. vs.
The State Board of Charities and Corrections of Kentucky.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Harvey Myers for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Thomas B.McGregor and Mr. Swager Sherley for the defendants in error.

Adams Express Company, Plaintiff in Error,
226. vs.
W. W. Darden.

This cause was argued by Mr. William L. Granberry for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. K. T. McConnico for the defendant in error.

The United States of America et al., Appellants,
228. vs.
The Village of Hubbard, Ohio.
The United States of America et al., Appellants,
229. vs.
The City of Wellsville, Ohio.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for The United States, continued by Mr. Charles Boyd for the City of Wellsville, Ohio, by Mr. Edmond H. Moore for the Village of Hubbard, Ohio, and concluded by Mr. P. J. Farrell for the Interstate Commerce Commission.

William Bernard Duke et al., Appellants,
230. vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Conrad H. Syme for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 23, 1924.-

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. Edward Wright, It is ordered that Charles M. Delameter, Esquire, of Oakland, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James W. Carmalt, It is ordered that Addison C. Burnham, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sidney C. Roach, It is ordered that Paul Barnett, Esquire, of Sedalia, State of Missouri, be admitted to practide as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sidney C. Roach, It is ordered that David W. Peters, Esquire, of Jefferson City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter H. Newton, It is ordered that Paul Andros Brooks, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Steel Producers' Export Corporation, Plaintiff in Error,
237. vs.
The Wilkoff Company.

On motion of Mr. Spencer Gordon in that behalf, It is ordered that this cause be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26.

William Bernard Duke et al., Appellants,
230. vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Conrad H. Syme for the appellants, by Mr. Henry M. Ward for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Conrad H. Syme for the appellants.

Wesley Hetrick, Plaintiff in Error,
231. vs.
Village of Lindsey et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Albert H. Fry for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. W. J. Mead for the defendants in error.

The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company, Petitioner,
232. vs.
Edmund R. Wells et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. A. H. Culwell for the petitioner, and submitted by Mr. George E. Wallace for the respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Riordon, It is ordered that Vernon M. Dorsey, Esquire, of Chevy Chase, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Riordon, It is ordered that Sidney F. Parham, Esquire, of Clarendon, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. Granville Munson, It is ordered that George T. Welch, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Burton K. Wheeler, It is ordered that James H. Baldwin, Esquire, of Butte, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Graham, It is ordered that Isaiah Campbell, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Charlie Hester,
Plaintiff in Error,
243. vs.
The United States.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Richard A. Ford for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the defendant in error.

Herbert Hoover, Secretary of Commerce, Plaintiff in Error,
244. vs.
The Intercity Radio Company, Inc.

This cause was continued, per stipulation.

The United States of America et al.,
Appellants,
627. vs.
The New River Company et al.
Slab Fork Coal Company et al.,
Appellants,
628. vs.
New River Company et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for The United States, continued by Mr. C. T. Bell for the appellants in No. 628; by Mr. James W. Carmalt for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. J. Carter Fort for the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Merlin W. Hixson,
Plaintiff in Error,
420. vs.
Louis D. Oakes.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Ray E. Nimmo for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. J. M. Friedlander and Mr. S. W. Odell for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Ray E. Nimmo for the plaintiff in error.

United Leather Workers International Union No. 66 et al.,
Appellants,
233. vs.
Herkert & Meisel Trunk Company et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. John P. Leahy for the appellants, and continued by Mr. Charles A. Houts for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, APRIL 25, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, It is ordered that John D. Costello, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Maurice G. Roberts, It is ordered that M. J. Henderson, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Ed P. Alexander, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Riley J. Wilson, It is ordered that C. Huffman Lewis, Esquire, of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
15, Orig'l vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant;
The United States of America, Intervener.

ORDER. The Commissioners heretofore designated to run, locate and mark upon the ground portions of the boundary line between the States of Texas and Oklahoma where it follows the course of the Red River, having this day presented a report with accompanying maps, showing that they have run, located, and marked upon the ground the portion of the boundary along the Big Bend area, and also a report, with accompanying map, showing that they have surveyed, run upon the ground, and platted the medial line between such State boundary and the northerly bank of the river for a length of three miles at and in the vicinity of the river bed oil wells;

And it further appearing from such reports that the said Commissioners have transmitted copies of such reports, with the accompanying maps, by registered mail to the Attorney General of the United States, the Attorney General of the State of Texas, and the Attorney General of the State of Oklahoma, and have lodged with the Clerk fifty additional copies of such reports and maps for the use of such private interveners as may apply for them;

It is ordered that the said reports, with the accompanying maps, be received and filed by the Clerk.

And it is further ordered that all objections or exceptions to such reports or either of them, if there be any such objections or exceptions, shall be presented to the court or filed with the clerk within a period of four weeks from this date; and the periods heretofore fixed for presenting or filing such objections or exceptions are limited and modified accordingly.

United Leather Workers International Union et al., Appellants,
233. vs.
Herkert & Meisel Trunk Company et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Charles A. Houts for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Mat J. Holland for the appellees.

Liberty National Bank of Roanoke, Virginia, Petitioner,
238. vs.
James A. Bear, Trustee etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. James D. Johnston for for the petitioner, continued by Mr. Harvey B. Apperson and Mr. James A. Bear for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. James D. Johnston for the petitioner.

E. L. Price et al.,

Plaintiffs in Error,

269. vs.

Drainage District No. 17, Mississippi County, Arkansas.

This cause was argued by Mr. Arthur T. Brewster for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. G. B. Rose for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, APRIL 28, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otto A. Schlobohm, It is ordered that Elizabeth P. Vilkomerson, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Newton K. Fox, It is ordered that Newton A. Tracy, Esquire, of Toledo, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. A. Wheat, It is ordered that Charles Kerr, Esquire, of Lexington, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. A. Wheat, It is ordered that T. M. Bigger, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert H. Miller, It is ordered that Haines H. Hargrett, Esquire, of Tifton, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The New York Central Railway Company
169. vs.
The United States of America.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered no, unless placed in the train to the rear of all cars having their brakes operated by the engineer.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Supreme Lodge, Knights of Pythias,
Plaintiff in Error,
214. vs.
George O. Meyer.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

(Separate opinion by Mr. Justice McReynolds).

Supreme Lodge, Knights of Pythias,
Plaintiff in Error,
215. vs.
Lina Kiser.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company, Appellant,
219. vs.
W. H. Osborne, as Tax Commissioner of the State of Nebraska, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company, Appellant,
224. vs.
W. H. Osborne, Jr., as State Tax Commissioner of the State of Nebraska, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Railway Company, Appellant,
225. vs.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The State of Missouri at the relation of the Burnes National Bank of St. Joseph,

Plaintiff in Error,

762. vs.

A. B. Duncan, Judge of the Probate Court of Buchanan County, Missouri.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Sutherland,

Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The State of Missouri at the relation of the Burnes National Bank of St. Joseph,

Plaintiff in Error,

762. vs.

A. B. Duncan, Judge of the Probate Court of Buchanan County, Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Henry V. Cunningham, Successor of Edward A. Thurston, Sole Surviving Trustee of the Bankrupt Estate of Charles Ponzi,

Petitioner,

213. vs.

Benjamin Brown, H. P. Holbrook, Patrick W. Horan, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

Harry A. Horine et al., Petitioners,

984. vs.

The United States.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of certiorari herein, without a certified copy of the record,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and the case docketed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. J. Buck, Appellant,

924. vs.

E. V. Kuykendall, Director of Public Works for the State of Washington.

On consideration of the motion for a stay herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, advanced for argument on Monday, November 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Modern Woodmen of America,
Petitioner,
861. vs.
Jennie Vida Mixer.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry A. Horine et al.,
Petitioners,
984. vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robins Dry Dock and Repair Company, Plaintiff in Error,
870. vs.
Lars Dahl.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company, Petitioner,
887. vs.
Alvin E. Durham Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied for lack of jurisdiction, there being no final decree.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Daisy M. Scott et al., Petitioners,
906. vs.
The City of Columbus, Ohio.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Prairie Oil & Gas Company,
Petitioner,
910. vs.
Louis F. Scandblum et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Patrick McGovern et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
918. vs.
The City of Boston.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New Creek Company, Petitioner,
923. vs.
Ephraim Lederer, Collector.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kawasaki Zosensho, Owner etc.,
Petitioner,
935. vs.
Cosulich Societa Triestina di Navigazione of Trieste, Italy, Owner etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Hettrick Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
936. vs.
James A. Shepherd Company, Limited.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Facer Forged Steel Car Wheel and Locomotive Wheel Company,
Petitioner,
937. vs.
Carnegie Steel Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William A. Brown & Company et al., Petitioners,
946. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs Appeals, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Nancy Roberts et al., Petitioners,
949. vs.
Atlantic Oil Producing Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The New York Central Railroad Company, Petitioner,
950. vs.
Joseph C. Dunbar.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be,

Alfred Emerson et al.,
Petitioners,
955. vs.
Radio Corporation of America et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Petitioner,
957. vs.
Robert E. Morrill, Sr.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel. Dong Yick Yuen,
Petitioner,
961. vs.
John F. Dunton, Chinese Inspector.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry D. Owens, Appellant,

235. vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Bromwell Brush and Wire Goods Company, Plaintiff in Error,

236. vs. In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

The State Board of Charities and Corrections of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. L. Pierce et al.,

Plaintiffs in Error, In Error to the Supreme Court of

239. vs. the State of Arkansas.

Drainage District No. 17, Mississippi County, Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Bernard Duke et al.,

Appellants, Appeal from the Court of Claims.

230. vs.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, set aside.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims with the following directions, one purpose of which is to elicit additional findings on questions of fact bearing on the right application of the cause of certain statutes of the United States, notably sections 5, 7, 8, and 9 of the act of September 7, 1916, c. 451, 39 Stat. 728, as amended by the act of July 15, 1918, c. 152, 40 Stat. 900:

1. To find (a) the nature, terms, and conditions of the offer to sell on the part of the United States Shipping Board which is mentioned in the court's second finding, (b) whether that offer was based on any appraisement of the vessels to be sold and whether there was any public advertisement of the offer, (c) whether the offer contemplated a sale of the vessels free from the conditions and restrictions referred to in section 8 of the act of 1916 and specified in section 9 thereof as amended, (d) whether the letter of December 15, 1919, by W. L. Mercer, acting manager of ship sales, which is set forth in the sixth finding, was written pursuant to a direction or authorization on the part of the Shipping Board, (e) whether the Shipping Board's resolution of December 19, 1919, which is set forth in the eighth finding, was intended to rescind the resolution of December 12, 1919, on the ground that the latter was void or that it was not an effective acceptance of W. Bernard Duke's proposal of December 5, 1919, but only a qualified acceptance which was as yet ineffective because Mr. Duke had not assented to the qualification, and (f) the amount of damages to which the plaintiffs are entitled if they have a right to recover damages.

2. To take further evidence, if need be, on which to base such additional findings.

3. To qualify or alter any of the existing findings, if need be, to bring them and the additional findings into accord.

4. To render upon all the findings when completed such judgment as shall appear to be right under the law, subject to the usual right of Appeal.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

May 26, 1924.

ORDER. The call of the docket will be suspended for the Term on Friday, May 2d next.

The Court will take a recess from Monday, May 5th, until Monday, May 12th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America to the use of Sue P. Gates,

Plaintiff in Error,

985. vs.

Frank M. Harshberger and The United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company.

Mr. Solicitor General Beck, in behalf of the defendants in error, having filed in open Court the following certificate, to wit:

"In the name of the United States at the relation and to the use of Sue P. Gates, Plaintiff, vs. Frank M. Harshberger, and the United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company, a corporation, Defendants.

United States of America,)
Western District of Washington) ss.

This certifies that, on the 10th day of October, A. D. 1923, a writ of error from the Supreme Court of the United States to said District Court was duly sued out by the plaintiff in the above entitled cause and allowed by the Judge of said District Court; that such writ of error was duly issued on the 10th day of October, A. D. 1923, and that a citation was duly issued thereon on that date, which original writ of error and citation were duly mailed, with the record on said writ of error, to the Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States by the Clerk of said District Court, on the 4th day of December, A. D. 1923,

WITNESS my hand and the Seal of said District Court, this 7th day of April, A. D. 1924.

(Signed) F. M. HARSHBERGER,
Clerk United States District Court for the Western District of Washington."

(SEAL).

and moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the ninth rule,

And it appearing to the Court that the plaintiff in error has failed to have its cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court,

It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, docketed and dismissed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District

Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank K. Bowers, Collector etc., Petitioner,
953. vs.
West Virginia Pulp and Paper Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner, and by Mr. John W. Davis for the respondent.

The Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, Petitioner,
607. vs.
Southern Pacific Company et al.

Motion for leave to take additional testimony herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John M. Woolsey for the petitioner in support of the motion, and by Mr. Charles C. Burlingham, Mr. Ray Rood Allen, and Mr. A. Howard Neely for the respondent in opposition thereto.

Arthur E. Donegan, Petitioner,
960. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander Akerman, and Mr. W. M. Toomerfor the petitioner.

Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, Plaintiff in Error,
785. vs.
The United States ex rel. Logan Rives.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to transfer to the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leslie C. Garnett and Mr. Burgess W. Marshall for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Mr. C. Edward Wright for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Pluto Oil & Gas Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
784. vs.
H. C. Miller.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. O. Lytle and Mr. W. V. Pryor for the defendant in error in support of the motion.

John G. Crosland, Petitioner,
841. vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bart A. Riley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

James C. Davis, Agent,
Plaintiff in Error,
899. vs.
L. L. Cohen & and Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court of Bristol County, Massachusetts, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur W. Blackman for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition.

B. F. Lee et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
905. vs.
Osceola and Little River Road Improvement District of Mississippi County, Arkansas.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles M. Bryan for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition.

San Joaquin Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
932. vs.
R. H. Dodd, Trustee etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Percy S. Webster for the petitioner, and by Mr. Arthur L. Shaw for the respondents.

Koppel Industrial Car and Equipment Company, Petitioner,
941. vs.
Albert E. Lee, Receiver.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry E. Warner for the petitioner, and by Mr. Philip N. Jones for the respondent.

M. J. Bashara, Petitioner,
948. vs.
George C. Hopkins, Collector of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry C. Weeks for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Ottinger, and Mr. Harvey B. Cox for the respondent.

Manfred W. Ehrich, Trustee etc., et al., Petitioners,
947. vs.
Charles J. Eisenlohr.

Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur Garfield Hays and Mr. Saul S. Myers for the petitioners, and by Mr. Owen J. Roberts for the respondent.

Emily R. Cadwalader et al., Executors etc.,
954. vs.
Edward L. Sturgess, etc., Collector of United States Internal Revenue etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Herbert Noble for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Ottinger, and Mr. Harvey B. Cox for the respondent.

Empire Gas & Fuel Company, Petitioner,
962. vs.
Lone Star Gas Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. M. Etheridge for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harry Preston Lawther for the respondent.

Belding Bros. & Co., Petitioner,
965. vs.
Benjamin L. Armstrong.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert B. Honeyman and Mr. Henry B. Twombley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Livingston Gifford for the respondent.

Old Colony Trust Company,
Petitioner,
970. vs.
Lawyers' Title Trust Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Eugene W. Leake and Mr. William C. Breed for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederick P. King for the respondent.

J. P. Evans, petitioner,
978. vs.
Pat Marr, Individually and as Trustee.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. D. Wilkinson and Mr. C. Huffman Lewis for the petitioner.

Louis Milam et al., Petitioners,
982. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert H. Talley for the petitioners.

William F. Quesse et al.,
Petitioners,
838. vs.
The People of the State of Illinois.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioners to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. W. Neil, Plaintiff in Error,
259. vs.
Utah Wholesale Grocery Company.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William R. Andrews and Mr. Joseph Chez for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Jacob Evans and Mr. Mahlon B. Wilson for the defendant in error.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
260. vs.
A. M. Burnett.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Thomas B. Pryor and Mr. Edward J. White for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Joe T. Robinson for the defendant in error.

James C. Davis, as Agent etc.,
Plaintiff in Error,
241. vs.
Charles Hareford.

This cause was argued by Mr. A. A. McLaughlin for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. C. A. Starbird for the defendant in error.

Nassau Smelting & Refining Works,
Petitioner,
242. vs.
Brightwood Bronze Foundry Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Joseph D. Jacobs for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harry M. Ehrlich for the respondent.

The Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Appellant,
247. vs.
The United States.

This cause was continued per stipulation.

The Illinois Central Railroad Company, Appellant,
248. vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. Benjamin Carter for the appellant, and by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the appellee.

William R. Warner & Company,
Petitioner,
32. vs.
Eli Lilly & Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. George W. Wickersham for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, APRIL 29, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. Barrett Prettyman, It is ordered that Robert Gallagher, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fritz G. Lanham, It is ordered that R. F. Milam, Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

William R. Warner & Company,
Petitioner,
32. vs.
Eli Lilly & Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. E. W. Bradford for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Francis Rawle for the petitioner.

The United States of America ex rel. the Baldwin Company,
Appellant,
251. vs.
Thomas E. Robertson, Commissioner of

This cause was argued by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for the appellant, and by Mr. Samuel S. Watson for the appellees.

Thomas Hammerschmidt et al.,
Petitioners,
254. vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Ed F. Alexander for the petitioners, and continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Davis for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, It is ordered that Nathan L. Miller, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fritz G. Lanham, It is ordered that George A. Hill, Jr., Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fritz G. Lanham, It is ordered that G. F. Dohrn, Esquire, of Mission, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merrill Moores, It is ordered that Howard S. Young, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Emanuel Celler, It is ordered that Fanny E. Holtzmann, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

Thomas Hammerschmidt et al.,
Petitioners,
254. vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Davis for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Ed. F. Alexander for the petitioners.

The People of the State of New York ex rel. The City of Buffalo,
Plaintiff in Error,
257. vs.
The Public Service Commission of the State of New York et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. George Clinton for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Henry W. Killeen for the defendant in error.

Harry H. Weiss, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
262. vs.
Louis Stearn.

Harry H. Weiss, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
263. vs.
John G. White.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the petitioners, continued by Mr. John G. White for the respondent in No. 263, and by Mr. Charles P. Hine for the respondent in No. 262, and concluded by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the petitioner.

Transportes Maritimos do Estado,
Plaintiff in Error,
265. vs.
Sylvio A. Almeida.

This cause was submitted by Mr. F. Dudley Kohler for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Silas B. Axtell for the defendant in error.

Air-Way Electric Appliance Corporation, Appellant,
266. vs.
Harry S. Day, Treasurer of the State of Ohio, et al.

Harry S. Day, Treasurer of the State of Ohio, et al.,
Appellants,
267. vs.
Air-Way Electric Appliance Corporation.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Newton A. Tracy for the appellant in No. 266, continued by Mr. William J. Meyer for the appellees in No. 266 and the appellants in No. 267.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, MAY 1, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wayne B. Wheeler, It is ordered that Brooklyn Bridge, Esquire, of Dennison, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred Sutro, It is ordered that Kenneth E. Stockton, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wayne B. Wheeler, It is ordered that George W. Reed, Esquire, of Uhrichsville, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Royal C. Johnson, It is ordered that Theodore M. Bailey, Esquire, of Sioux Falls, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. W. Root, It is ordered that Fred S. Hudson, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George A. Prevost, It is ordered that George K. Large, Esquire, of Flemington, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
15, Orig'l. vs.
The State of Texas,
Defendant;
The United States,
Intervener.

On motion of Mr. John S. Flannery in that behalf, the Twelfth Report of the Receiver was filed.

Claude E. Barnes,
Plaintiff in Error,
274. vs.
The People of the State of New York.

This cause was continued, per stipulation.

Magnum Import Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
278. vs.
Francois Joseph de Spoturno Coty.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Otto A. Schlotohm, in behalf of counsel for the petitioner, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Max L. Cohn, Trading as The Maclen Import Company,

Petitioner,

279. vs.

Francois Joseph de Spoturno Coty.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Otto A. Schlobohm, in behalf of counsel for the petitioner, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arthur Baum et al., Trading as The Beautex Company,

Petitioners,

280. vs.

Francois Joseph de Spoturno Coty.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Otto A. Schlobohm, in behalf of counsel for the petitioner, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Magnum Import Company,

Petitioner,

281. vs.

Houbigant, Inc.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Otto A. Schlobohm, in behalf of counsel for the petitioner, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ivory Novelties Trading Company,
Petitioner,
282. vs.
Francois Joseph de Spoturno Coty.

On motion of Mr. Otto A. Schlobohm in that behalf, It is ordered that this cause be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26.

Air-Way Electric Appliance Corporation, Appellant,
266. vs.
Harry S. Day, Treasurer of the State of Ohio, et al.

Harry S. Day, Treasurer of the State of Ohio, et al.,
Appellants,
267. vs.
Air-Way Electric Appliance Corporation.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. William J. Meyer for the appellees in No. 266 and the appellants in No. 267, and concluded by Mr. Newton A. Tracy for the appellant in No. 266 and the appellee in No.267.

Kansas City Southern Railway Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
269. vs.
Road Improvement District No. 3 of Sevier County, Arkansas, et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Samuel W. Moore for the plaintiffs in error, and submitted by Mr. Hal L. Norwood for the defendants in error.

Charles Boettcher et al., as Receivers etc.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
270. vs.
The Public Utilities Commission of the State of Colorado et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Elmer L. Brock for the plaintiffs in error, continued by Mr. Robert E. More and Mr. Kenax Huffman for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. Elmer L. Brock for the plaintiffs in error.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error,
272. vs.
Mrs. T. V. Prude.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Edward J. White and Mr. Thomas B. Pryor for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. S. S. Hargraves, Mr. S. H. Mann, Sr., and Mr. S. H. Mann, Jr., for the defendant in error.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
272. vs.
Mrs. T. V. Prude.

This cause was submitted by Mr. Edward J. White and Mr. Thomas B. Pryor for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. S. S. Hargraves, Mr. S. H. Mann, Sr., and Mr. S. H. Mann, Jr., for the defendant in error.

Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian, et al.,
Appellants,
273. vs.
Frederick Y. Robertson.

On motion of Mr. Alfred Sutro for Frederick Y. Robertson, leave was granted to file an additional brief herein on or before Wednesday next.

Frederick Y. Robertson, Appellant,
493. vs.
Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian, et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Lindley M. Garrison for Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian, et al., and continued by Mr. Alfred Sutro for Frederick Y. Robertson.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Cassius C. Dowell, It is ordered that W. H. McHenry, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. A. Wheat, It is ordered that Cornelius C. Billings, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. A. Wheat, It is ordered that George N. Gardiner, Esquire, of New Bedford, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otto A. Schlobohm, It is ordered that Louis Hirschberg, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otto A. Schlobohm, It is ordered that Maxwell C. Katz, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage, It is ordered that Luther Burns, Esquire, of Topeka, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard Yates, It is ordered that Richard Yates Hoffman, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Frank Staley, It is ordered that Milton Gladstone, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Aubrey B. Fennell, It is ordered that I. Clinton Kline, Esquire, of Sunbury, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Nassau Smelting & Refining Works, Limited, Plaintiff in Error,
277. vs.
The United States.

On motion of Mr. Otto Schlobohm in that behalf, It is ordered that this cause be passed, to be restored to the call pursuant to Section 9, Rule 26.

Transportes Maritimos do Estado, Plaintiff in Error,
265. vs.
Sylvio A. Almeida.

On motion of Mr. F. Dudley Kohler for the plaintiff in error, leave was granted to file an additional brief herein.

Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian, et al., Appellants,

273. vs.

Frederick Y. Robertson.

Frederick Y. Robertson,

Appellant,

495. vs.

Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian, et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Alfred Sutro and Mr. C. W. Stockton for Frederick Y. Robertson, and concluded by Mr. Lindley M. Garrison for Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian, et al.

New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk Telegraph Company,

Plaintiff in Error,

275. vs.

John I. Dolan, Collector of Taxes etc.

Leave was granted counsel for the plaintiff in error to file a supplemental brief herein on or before Tuesday next.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Overton Harris for the plaintiff in error, continued by Mr. Horace Greeley Eastburn for the plaintiff in error, and concluded by Mr. Caleb S. Layton for the defendant in error.

The United States ex rel. Chicago, New York & Boston Refrigerator Company,

Appellant,

288. vs.

Interstate Commerce Commission.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William G. Wheeler for the appellant, continued by Mr. J. Carter Fort for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Edward M. Hyzer for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Roscoe Davis, It is ordered that Frank M. Halstead, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Anthony J. Grasso, It is ordered that Onofrio Rella, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court inthis behalf by Mr. Alex. Wolf, It is ordered that Nathan Cayton, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom D. McKeown, It is ordered that W. D. Potter, Esquire, of Ardmore, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. A. Ayres, It is ordered that Hal M. Black, Esquire, of Wichita, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that J. Harry Byrne, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; Roswell P. Magill,, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois; Benjamin H. Bartholow, Esquire, of Mt. Vernon, State of New York; ~~sep.~~ Frank J. Ready, Jr., Esquire, of Nashville, State of Tennessee; James McG. Williamson, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; Mark A. Watson, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; Aubrey R. Marrs, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York; and Errett C. Smith, of Minneapolis, State of Kansas, . be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. W. Harrold, It is ordered that R. N. McConnell, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. W. Harrold, It is ordered that James D. Carmichael, Esquire, of Chickasha, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Barrett Carter, It is ordered that William Edris, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. Prescott Gatley, It is ordered that Arthur P. Drury, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul E. Lesh, It is ordered that Lion S. Birney, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert H. Lovett, It is ordered that Judd Dewey, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Angus A. McLaughlin, It is ordered that Harry McCall, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Norfolk & Western Railway Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
187. vs.
The Public Service Commission of West Virginia.

In Error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjuiged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
198. vs.
Central Iron & Coal Company.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjuiged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of

and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Alabama.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Charlie Hester,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of South Carolina.

243.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

George W. Cook,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Galen L. Tait, United States Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Maryland.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland.

220.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, Petitioner,
vs.
Southern Pacific Company.

On consideration of the motion of the petitioner for leave to take additional testimony herein,

607.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, such additional testimony to be taken in accordance with Rule 12, Paragraph 2, of the Rules of this Court; to be limited to the subject matter specified in the motion, and to be upon interrogatories presented and served upon the oppo-

site party by the petitioner on or before the first day of June next, and upon cross-interrogatories to be filed on or before the twentieth day of June next. The interrogatories and cross-interrogatories and the evidence taken shall be forwarded to this Court on or before the first day of September next.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT William Parkin, Esquire, Clerk of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, be, and he is hereby, designated the Commissioner to take and return the additional testimony in this cause in accordance with this order.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT the costs of this Commission, when incurred, shall be paid by the petitioner.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, Plaintiff in Error,
783. vs.
The United States of America ex rel. Logan Rives.

On consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause, IT IS NOW HERE ORDERED BY THIS COURT that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this cause be, and the same is hereby, placed on the summary docket and assigned for argument on Monday, November 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Appellant,
227. vs.
James Reed.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. E. Bullock et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
194. vs.
Dermott-Collins Road Improvement District et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed ~~with costs,~~ on the ground that the question in the case has become moot; with costs to be paid by the plaintiffs in error; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court with direction to remand to the Chancery Court of Chicot County with direction to that Court to dismiss the suit without prejudice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Agent etc., Plaintiff in Error,
241. vs.
Charles Hareford.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The People of the State of New York ex rel. The City of Buffalo, Plaintiff in Error,
257. vs.
The Public Service Commission of the State of New York et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. W. Neil, Plaintiff in Error,
259. vs.
Utah Wholesale Grocery Company.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Utah.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Utah, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
260. vs.
A. M. Burnett.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

(*Insert No.260,p.574½).

Charles Boettcher et al., Receivers of the Denver & Salt Lake Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
270. vs.
The Public Utilities Commission of the State of Colorado et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pluto Oil & Gas Company et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
734. vs.
H. C. Miller.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

(*Insert after No. 260, p. 574).
Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,

Plaintiff in Error,

260. vs.

A. M. Burnett.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for lack of submission under the rule.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. F. Gravins, Petitioner,
570. vs.
Walker D. Hines, Director General etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John G. Crosland, Petitioner,
841. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

San Joaquin Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
932. vs.
R. H. Dodd, Trustee etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Koppel Industrial Car & Equipment Company, Petitioner,
941. vs.
Albert E. Lee, Receiver.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

M. J. Bashara, Petitioner,
942. vs.
George C. Hopkins, Collector of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Manfred W. Ehrich, Trustee etc., et al., Petitioners,
947. vs.
Charles J. Eisenlohr.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank K. Bowers, Collector etc., Petitioner,
953. vs.
West Virginia Pulp & Paper Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Emily R. Cadwalader et al., Executors etc., Petitioners,
954. vs.
Edward L. Sturgess, etc., Collector of United States Internal Revenue etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arthur E. Donegan, Petitioner,
960. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Empire Gas & Fuel Company, Petitioner,
962. vs.
Lone Star Gas Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Belding Bros. & Company,
Petitioner,
965. vs.
Benjamin L. Armstrong.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Old Colony Trust Company,
Petitioner,
970. vs.
Lawyers' Title & Trust Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. P. Evans, Petitioner,
978. vs.
Pat Marr, Individually and as Trustee etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louis Milam et al., Petitioners,
982. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and

of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant;
The United States, Intervener.
15, Orig'l.

It appearing from the Twelfth Report made by Frederic A. Delano, the Receiver in this cause, that an action recently commenced against him in the District Court of Wichita County, Texas, by J. H. Duhon and E. J. Kebideaux to recover from him certain moneys for the drilling of a river-bed well, now known as No. 168 and also as Delta Well, which had been drilled prior to the Receivership; and it being asserted that such action was commenced in disregard of the exclusive jurisdiction of this Court over the said Receivership and the said Receiver,

It is now here ordered by this Court that cause be shown by the said J. H. Duhon and E. J. Kebideaux, before this Court, at the City of Washington, on Monday, May 26th, 1924, why they should not be enjoined from prosecuting or maintaining the said action in the District Court of Wichita County, Texas, unless in the meantime they shall have dismissed that action and filed in this Court due proof of such dismissal.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

No. 15, Original.—October Term, 1923.

State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. State of Texas, Defendant. The United States, Intervener.

[May 5, 1924.]

Per Curiam.

After considering the twelfth report of the receiver herein and the earlier reports referred to therein, it is ordered that all parties in interest be accorded until and including the 23d day of May 1924, to prepare and file with the clerk in printed form such suggestions, contentions and supporting arguments as they severally may desire to present respecting the following subjects:

1. The extent to which and the manner in which the expenses of conducting and administering the receivership shall be spread over the several impounded funds in the receiver's custody and over the several areas and tracts from which such funds were derived, and also the proportions in which such expenses shall be deducted from the payments ultimately to be made to the several claimants who may be entitled to receive those funds from the receiver.

2. The mode of distributing or disposing of expenses incurred and losses sustained in respect of wells which have proved unremunerative.

3. Whether the order of June 1, 1921, authorizing the receiver to make certain payments reimbursing operators and drillers of river-bed wells (256 U. S. 607) shall be changed and enlarged so as to include and cover river-bed wells which subsequently proved to be unremunerative in instances where the same operator had drilled or was in process of drilling other river-bed wells which have proved productive and have yielded funds from which such reimbursement may be made,—reference being particularly had to wells numbered 149, 150, 151, 155, 161 and 163, described on pages nine and ten of the Receiver's Tenth Report.

4. Whether the order of June 1, 1921, just mentioned shall be further changed and enlarged so as to include and cover river-bed well No. 139, otherwise known as the Burk-Senator Well.

Maple Flooring Manufacturers Association et al.,

Appellants,

920. vs.

The United States of America.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellee, and concurred in by Mr. Jacob Newman, Mr. Conrad Poppenhusen, Mr. H. L. Stern, and Mr. Edward R. Johnston for the appellants.

The United States of America, Owner of Steamships "Luke Fairlee", etc.,

Petitioner,

956. vs.

Sugarland Industries et al., Trustees etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Ottinger, and Mr. J. Frank Staley for the petitioner.

Ex parte In the Matter of Lehigh Valley Railroad Company.

Original. Petitioner.
(Action No. 1).

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of prohibition and/or a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Boston and Mr. Lindley M. Garrison for the petitioner.

Ex parte In the matter of Lehigh Valley Railroad Company.

Petitioner,

Original.
(Action No. 2).

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of prohibition and/or a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Boston

Second Russian Insurance Company,
Appellant,
968. vs.
Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian, et al.

The motion that this cause be heard on nine printed copies of the record was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Albert P. Massey and Mr. William S. Thomson for the appellant.

George R. Meek, Petitioner,
590. vs.
Centre County Banking Company et al.
Florence F. Dale, Petitioner,
591. vs.
Centre County Banking Company et al.
Andrew Breeze, Petitioner,
592. vs.
Centre County Banking Company et al.

The suggestion of death of John M. Shugert, and motion to substitute George H. Shugert, Administrator of the Estate of John M. Shugert, deceased, as a party respondent herein, were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel D. Gettig and Mr. James C. Furst in support of the motion, and by Mr. Mortimer C. Rhone, Mr. Ellis L. Orvis, and Mr. Harry Keller for the petitioner in opposition thereto.

George R. Meek, Petitioner,
590. vs.
Centre County Banking Company et al.
Florence F. Dale, Petitioner,
591. vs.
Centre County Banking Company et al.
Andrew Breeze, Petitioner,
592. vs.
Centre County Banking Company et al.

The petition to amend the original petition, and for leave to intervene herein, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Newton B. Spangler for the petitioning creditors in support of the petition, and by Mr. Mortimer C. Rhone, Mr. Ellis L. Orvis, and Mr. Harry Keller for the petitioners in opposition thereto.

American Railway Express Company,
Petitioner,
991. vs.
George C. Daniel.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. Prescott Gatley in behalf of Mr. Robert C. Alston for the petitioner.

Ozark Pipe Line Corporation,
Appellant,
575. vs.
Roy Monier et al., etc.

The motion to advance this cause

was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Levi Cooke in that behalf.

Nicholas A. Dawson, Petitioner,
928. vs.
Mrs. Charles D. Gondran et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles T. Wortham for the petitioner, and by Mr. Percy S. Benedict for the respondents.

The Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Company et al., Petitioners,
951. vs.
H. L. Cookerham, Administrator etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles N. Burch and Mr. H. D. Minor for the petitioners.

Seaby Phillips, Petitioner,
952. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Max Isaac for the petitioner.

Oliver M. Tucker et al., Petitioners,
967. vs.
Karl E. Peiler et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George W. Ramsey for the petitioners, and by Mr. Vernon M. Dorsey, Mr. Sidney F. Parham, and Mr. John P. Bartlett for the respondents.

Edward Hines Yellow Pine Trustees, Petitioners,
971. vs.
Anna F. C. Martin et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. J. Wills and Mr. T. W. Davis for the petitioners, and by Mr. Clayton D. Potter for the respondents.

George W. Miles, Petitioner,
975. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ely Rosenberg for the petitioner.

James C. Davis, Director General etc., Petitioner,
819. vs.
Corona Coal Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. Harry McCall for the petitioner, and submitted by Mr. Richard B. Montgomery for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, May 12th, 1924.

MONDAY, MAY 12, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that John S. Pratt, Esquire, of Toledo, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earle B. Mayfield, It is ordered that W. P. McLean, Jr., Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Beck, It is ordered that John L. Slattery, Esquire, of Glasgow, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. C. Mayer, It is ordered that Arthur J. W. Hilly, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas J. Walsh, It is ordered that Edmond C. Toomey, Esquire, of Helena, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Burton K. Wheeler, It is ordered that Albert A. Grorud, Esquire, of Helena, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. H. Rumble, It is ordered that Gerould M. Rumble, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chester I. Long, It is ordered that Claude I. Depew, Esquire, of Wichita, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George L. Morton, It is ordered that E. C. Chapman, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Phil D. Swing, It is ordered that Warren E. Libby, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Simon Hecht and Summit L. Hecht, Trustees,

Petitioners,

99. vs.

John F. Malley, Former Collector of Internal Revenue.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record

from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed as to taxes assessed for the years ending June 30, 1919, and June 30, 1920, and reversed as to those assessed for the six months ending June 30, 1917, and the year ending June 30, 1918; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

(Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Brandeis took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause).

Arthur I. Howard and Robert S. Barlow, Trustees,
Petitioners,
100. vs.
John F. Malley, Former Collector of Internal Revenue.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

(Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Brandeis took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause).

Arthur L. Howard and Robert S. Barlow, Trustees,
Petitioners,
101. vs.
Andrew J. Casey, Former Acting Collector of Internal Revenue.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and

was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

(Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Brandeis took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause).

Alvah Crocker et al., Trustees,
Petitioners,
119. vs.
John F. Malley, Collector.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

(Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Brandeis took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause).

Brooks-Scanlon Corporation,
Appellant,
367. vs.
The United States.

The United States, Appellant,
385. vs.
Brooks-Scanlon Corporation.

Appeals from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, on appeal and cross-appeal, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be,

and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Separate opinion by Mr. Justice McReynolds.
(Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause).

The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company, Petitioner,
232. vs.
Edmund R. Wells et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Transportes Maritimos do Estado,
Plaintiff in Error,
265. vs.
Sylvio A. Almeida.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, transferred to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, pursuant to the Act of Congress of September 14, 1922.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
272. vs.
Mrs. T. V. Prude.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
272. vs.
Mrs. T. V. Prude.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
272. vs.
Mrs. T. V. Prude.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk Telegraph Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
275. vs.
John I. Dolan, Collector of Taxes for the Southern District of the City of Wilmington.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Delaware.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record

from the Supreme Court of the State of Delaware, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Charles D. Newton, as Attorney General etc., et al., Appellants, (On rehearing). vs. Consolidated Gas Company of New York. 565.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of the Skinner & Eddy Corporation, Petitioner. No. 28, Original.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of mandamus and/or a writ of prohibition herein, and of the return to the rule to show cause and the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the rule to show cause be made absolute, and that the writ of mandamus as prayed be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

Ex parte In the matter of the Lehigh Valley Railroad Company.
Original.(Action No.1). Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of prohibition and/or a writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of the Lehigh Valley Railroad Company.
Original.(Action No.2). Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of prohibition and/or a writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Second Russian Insurance Company,
Appellant,
968. vs.
Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian, et al.

On consideration of the motion that this cause be allowed to be heard on nine printed copies of the record,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George R. Meek, Petitioner,
590. vs.
Centre County Banking Company et al.
Florence F. Dale, Petitioner,
591. vs.
Centre County Banking Company et al.
Andrew Breese, Petitioner,
592. vs.
Centre County Banking Company et al.

On consideration of the suggestion of death of John M. Shugert, and the motion to substitute George H. Shugert, Administrator of the Estate of the said John M. Shugert, deceased, as a party respondent herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said suggestion of death be, and the same is hereby, entered; and that the said motion to substitute be, and the same is hereby, granted.

It is further ordered that these cases be, and the same are hereby, set for hearing on Monday, November 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day, on the issues including that of the right of the Administrator to continue this proceeding in bankruptcy.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George R. Meek, Petitioner,

590. vs.

Centre County Banking Company et al., etc.

Florence F. Dale, Petitioner,

591. vs.

Centre County Banking Company et al., etc.

Andrew Breeze, Petitioner,

592. vs.

Centre County Banking Company et al., etc.

On consideration of the motion of W. J. Emerick, Roy Wilkinson, and H. E. Holtzworth, to amend the original petition, and for leave to intervene herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, without prejudice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ozark Pipe Line Corporation,

Appellant,

575. vs.

Roy Monier et al., constituting the State Tax Commission of the State of Missouri, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause placed on the summary docket and assigned for argument on Monday, November 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Maple Flooring Manufacturers Association et al.,

Appellants,

920. vs.

The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Times Square Auto Supply Company,
Appellant,
129. vs.
Kansas City, Missouri, et al.

It is ordered by this Court that the mandate in this cause heretofore issued on the 27th day of February, be, and the same is hereby, recalled, for reformation.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward Hines Yellow Pine Trustees,
Petitioners,
971. vs.
Anna F. C. Martin et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Railway Express Company,
Petitioner,
991. vs.
George C. Daniel.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Melsie Bailey, Petitioner,
707. vs.
Claude Jones et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

T. R. Bennett, Superintendent of Banks for the State of Georgia, Petitioner,
909. vs.
John E. Schwarz et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

IT IS NOW HERE ORDERED BY THIS COURT that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Nicholas A. Dawson, Petitioner,
928. vs.
Mrs. Charles D. Gondran et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Company et al., Petitioners,
951. vs.
H. L. Cookerham, Administrator etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Seaby Phillips, Petitioner,
952. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Owner of the Steamship "Lake Fairlie", etc.,
Petitioner,
956. vs.
Sugarland Industries et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oliver M. Tucker et al.,
Petitioners,
967. vs.
Karl K. Feiler et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George H. Miles, Petitioner,
975. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein

to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
15, Original. vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant;
The United States, Intervener.

ORDER. The Receiver is hereby authorized to make the following payments of the Receivership:

To Nagel & Kirby the sum of $2,500.00 as compensation for services rendered by them between December 11, 1922, and May 1, 1924;

To McKenney & Flannery the sum of $20,000.00 as compensation for services rendered by them between December 6, 1922, and May 1, 1924;

And to Frederic A. Delano the sum of $32,000.00 on account of his services as Receiver.

The State of New Mexico, Complainant,
3, Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

The motion to set this cause for hearing was submitted by Mr. A. A. Jones in behalf of counsel.

The State of New Mexico, Complainant,
14, Original. vs.
The State of Colorado.

The motion to open, file and publish the testimony in this cause, and to set the cause for hearing, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. A. Jones in behalf of counsel.

Ex parte In the matter of the City of New York, The Transit Commission, et al.,
——, Original. Petitioners.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of prohibition and/or a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. B. C. Mayer in behalf of counsel for the petitioners.

Orinoco Company, Limited, John W. Le Crone, Receiver of the Orinoco Company, Limited, et al.,
Appellants,
1018. vs.
The Orinoco Iron Company.

Mr. William R. Marr, of counsel for the appellee, having filed in open Court the following certificate, to wit:

"Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

I, Henry W. Hodges, Clerk of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, do hereby certify that in a certain cause pending in said Court, wherein Orinoco Company, Limited; John W. Le Crone, Receiver of the Orinoco Company, Limited; Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, et al., were appellants, and The Orinoco Iron Company was appellee, a final decree was rendered by said Court of Appeals on the 3rd day of March, A. D. 1924, in favor of the said appellee, and against the said appellants, and that on the 2nd day of April, A. D. 1924, said appellants Orinoco Company, Limited, and John W. Le Crone were allowed an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States and that deposit in lieu of bond was made on April 2nd, A. D. 1924, and on April 2nd, A. D. 1924, the said Orinoco Company, Limited, and John W. LeCrone, Receiver of the Orinoco Company, Limited, sued out a citation directed to the said appellee, The Orinoco Iron Company, which citation was served and returned on the 3rd day of April, A. D. 1924.

In Testimony Whereof I hereunto subscribe my name and affix the Seal of said Court of Appeals, at the City of Washington, this fifth day of May, A. D. 1924.

(SEAL). (Signed) HENRY W. HODGES, Clerk."

and moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the ninth rule.

And it appearing to the Court that the appellants have failed to have their cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court,

It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, docketed and dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Agent etc., Petitioner,
vs.
John O'Hara.
326.

The motion that James C. Davis, as Agent of President Coolidge, be substituted as the party respondent in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by counsel in that behalf.

James C. Davis, Agent of the President and Director General of Railroads, Petitioner,
114. vs.
Portland Seed Company.

James C. Davis, Agent of the President and Director General of Railroads,
123. vs.
A. J. Parrington.

The petition of James C. Davis, Agent etc., for further consideration of points in the record in this cause, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John F. Finerty in that behalf.

The Cleveland & Western Coal Company, Petitioner,
999. vs.
Main Island Creek Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. F. Taplin for the petitioner, and by Mr. John H. Holt and Mr. Murray Seasongood for the respondent.

Alge Howell, Petitioner,
969. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George J. Gulotta for the petitioner.

Randolph Whitman, as Chairman etc., et al., Petitioners,
972. vs.
Bondholders Committee of December 1, 1921, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Szold for the petitioners, and by Mr. Mark Hyman for the respondents.

The Dennison Brick & Tile Company, Petitioner,
976. vs.
Chicago Trust Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Smith W. Bennett for the petitioner, and by Mr. George W. Reed and Mr. Brooklyn Bridge for the respondents.

Mary Brafman, Petitioner,
983. vs.
Benjamin Brafman et al., Administrators etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland was submitted to the consideration of the

Court by Elizabeth F. Vilkomerson for the petitioner.

H. S. Kress & Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Bessie Lee Crosby. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

867.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiffs in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, May 26, 1924.

MONDAY, MAY 26, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Benjamin Slade, It is ordered that Arthur B. O'Keefe, Esquire, of West Haven, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. A. Ledbetter, It is ordered that Louis A. Ledbetter, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. Ellis Moore, It is ordered that John S. Black, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. W. Ramseyer, It is ordered that Paul N. Grubb, Esquire, of Janesville, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry S. Barger, It is ordered that James M. Stump, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William B. Mathews, It is ordered that Max Loewenthal, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., It is ordered that Marion W. Ripy, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. A. Leibetter, It is ordered that Joseph P. Duffy, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi H. David, It is ordered that Harlan Wood, Esquire, of Spartanburg, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William B. Mathews, It is ordered that Elmer W. Heald, Esquire, of Calipatria, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. H. Carrigan, It is ordered that James T. Montgomery, Esquire, of Wichita Falls, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. MOrven Thompson, It is ordered that Laurence E. Coffey, Esquire, of Buffalo,

State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earl J. Davis, It is ordered that James J. Spillane, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. O. H. B. Bloodworth, Jr., It is ordered that Thomas E. Sullivan, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. W. Ramseyer, It is ordered that James G. Shifflett, Esquire, of Grinnell, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Spalding Flannery, It is ordered that John R. Cochran, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earl J. Davis, It is ordered that Delos G. Smith, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Driver, It is ordered that A. D. DuLaney, Esquire, of Ashdown, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James Craig Peacock, It is ordered that Elliott Bartram Richards, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Adrien F. Busick, It is ordered that Elmer J. Davidson, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David A. Reed, It is ordered that W. Lloyd Miller, Esquire, of Braddock, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Loring, It is ordered that G. A. Youngquist, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Fannie I. Peter, It is ordered that Pearl M. Hart, ~~Esquire~~, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry Stanbrough Mcnell, It is ordered that John Macauley Abbott, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fritz G. Lanham, It is ordered that Will C. Austin, Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly;

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas W. Gregory, It is ordered that Paul Cocksey, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earl J. Davis, It is ordered that J. Ernest Converse, Esquire, of Lansing, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of

this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Paul U. Farley, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Altheus Johnson, It is ordered that Howard M. Brock, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard N. Elliott, It is ordered that Elmer J. Binford, Esquire, of Greenfield, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earl B. Mayfield, It is ordered that Gossett Greer, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. P. P. Campbell, It is ordered that Lorraine Elizabeth Wooster, ~~Esquire,~~ of Salina, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earl B. Mayfield, It is ordered that Herbert C. Wade, Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earl B. Mayfield, It is ordered that Charles L. Morgan, Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. W. Clark, It is ordered that DeLancey C. Smith, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Halbert Perry Brown, It is ordered that Frederick R. Williams, Esquire, of Bel Air, Harford County, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. O'Brien, It is ordered that John J. McCarthy, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Morgan G. Sanders, It is ordered that W. B. Wynne, Esquire, of Wills Point, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr.Morgan G. Sanders, It is ordered that Angus G. Wynne, Esquire, of Kaufman, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Morgan G. Sanders, It is ordered that Buck J. Wynne, Esquire, of Wills Point, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Morgan G. Sanders, It is ordered that Taddie L. Wynne, Esquire, of Kaufman, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas M. Woodward, It is ordered that FitzWilliam McMaster Woodrow, of Columbia, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John F. Finerty, It is ordered that Alexander M. Bull, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Driver, It is ordered that J. B. Reed, Esquire, of Lonoke, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The City of Opelika, Appellant,
524. vs.
Opelika Sewer Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Alabama.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Alabama, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, as Agent of the United States, Petitioner,
819. vs.
Corona Coal Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeal of the Parish of Orleans of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeal of the Parish of Orleans of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeal in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeal for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

St. Cloud Public Service Company, Appellant,
10. vs.
The City of St. Cloud.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Mr. Justice Butler took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

Liberty National Bank of Roanoke, Virginia, Petitioner,
238. vs.
James A. Bear, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estates of W. L. Becker, Sr., and W. L. Becker, Jr., Partners etc.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Virginia for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

R. B. Sheehan Company and Aetna Life Insurance Company,

R. E. Sheehan Company and Aetna Life Insurance Company,

Plaintiffs in Error,

593. vs.

George K. Shuler, as State Treasurer of the State of New York; John D. Higgins, Richard H. Curran, and Francis Perkins, as and constituting the State Industrial Board of the State of New York.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

New York State Railways,

Plaintiff in Error,

103. vs.

George K. Shuler, as Treasurer of the State of New York. John D. Higgins, Richard H. Curran, et al., etc.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Margaret C. Lynch, Executor of the Last Will and Testament of E. J. Lynch, Collector of Internal Revenue, deceased,

Petitioner,

139. vs.

Tilden Produce Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and

that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

John Swendig, James W. Miller, Remigus Grab, et al., Appellants, vs. The Washington Water Power Company. 142. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Idaho.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

R. Asakura, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of Seattle, Harry W. Carroll, Comptroller, and William H. Searing, Chief of Police, of the City of Seattle. 211. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

A. P. Kennedy and John Kennedy vs. The United States of America. 222. On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered in the negative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

William Lucking, Appellant,
212. vs.
Detroit and Cleveland Navigation Company.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The United States ex rel. Chicago, New York & Boston Refrigerator Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
288. vs.
Interstate Commerce Commission.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The State of Missouri on the relation of Jesse W. Barrett, Attorney General; Public Service Commission of Missouri, and Kansas City Gas Company,

Appellants,

155. vs.

Kansas Natural Gas Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The Kansas Natural Gas Company,

Plaintiff in Error,

135. vs.

The State of Kansas on the relation of A. E. Helm, Attorney for the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Kansas.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The State of Kansas on the relation of Fred S. Jackson, Attorney for the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Kansas, et al.,

Appellants,

137. vs.

The Central Trust Company of New York, Kansas Natural Gas Company, and Consumers Light, Heat & Power Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record

from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Commissioner of Immigration of Port of New York, Petitioner,
221. vs.
Gittel Gottlieb and Israel Gottlieb.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, without prejudice to any right which respondents may have under Section 4 (d) of the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924, or under House Joint Resolution No. 283, approved June 7, 1924; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Adams Express Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
226. vs.
W. W. Darden.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court

of the United States for the Middle District of Tennessee.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

(Mr. Justice Sanford took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause).

Nassau Smelting & Refining Works, Limited, Petitioner,
242. vs.
Brightwood Bronze Foundry Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The United States of America et al., Appellants,
456. vs.
Abilene & Southern Railway Company et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Harry H. Weiss, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
862. vs.
Louis Stearn.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record

from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

(Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Brandeis dissent on the ground that the case falls within the rule declared in Cullinan v. Walker, 262 U. S. 154).

Harry H. Weiss, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. John G. White. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

263.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

(Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Brandeis dissent on the ground that the case falls within the rule declared in Cullinan v. Walker, 262 U. S.134).

Marlin W. Hixson, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Louis D. Oakes. — In Error to the District Court of Appeal for the Second Appellate District of the State of California.

420.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of Appeal for the Second Appellate District of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, as Agent under Section 206 of the Transportation Act of 1920,

Petitioner,

757. vs.

Timothy Donovan, as Owner of the Deck Scow "Mary Ethel", and Theodore A. Crane's Sons Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

B. I. Salinger, Jr., Appellant,

341. vs.

Victor Loisel, United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

B. I. Salinger, Jr., Appellant,

342. vs.

Victor Loisel, United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and

decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

B. I. Salinger, Jr., Appellant,
341. vs. States
Victor Loisel, United Marshal etc.

B. I. Salinger, Jr., Appellant,
342. vs.
Victor Loisel, United States Marshal etc.

B. I. Salinger, Jr., Petitioner,
705. vs. The United States and
Victor Loisel, United States Marshal etc.

It is ordered by this Court that the mandates in these cases issue forthwith and embody an order requiring, under the bail given on the appeals in Nos. 341 and 342 and under that given on the granting of the writ of certiorari in No. 705, that Salinger surrender himself into the custody of the Marshal for the Eastern District of Louisiana, at New Orleans, within ten days from the day the mandate bears date preparatory to a removal under the warrant heretofore issued by the District Judge of that District; or, in the alternative, that he surrender himself within such ten days into the custody of the Marshal for the District of South Dakota at some place within that District, to be dealt with according to law.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

B. I. Salinger, Jr., Petitioner,
705. vs.
The United States of America and Victor Loisel, as United States Marshal, Eastern District of Louisiana.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Wong Doo, Petitioner,
736. vs.
The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court, and, as so modified, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The Illinois Central Railroad Company, Appellant,
248. vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The United States, Appellant,
217. vs.
Charles J. Ferris.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel.
The Baldwin Company, Appellant,
251. vs.
Thomas E. Robertson, as Commissioner of Patents, and R. S. Howard Company.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the ~~said~~ Supreme Court of the District of Columbia for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas Hammerschmidt, Lotta Burke, Charles Thiemann, et al.,
Petitioners,
254. vs.
The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Appellant,
447. vs.
The Supplee-Biddle Hardward Company.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by

and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Company, Appellant,

540. vs.

E. V. Kuykendall, as Director of Public Works of Washington, et al., etc., et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Company,

Appellant,

789. vs.

E. V. Kuykendall, as Director of Public Works of Washington, et al., etc., et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Home Telephone & Telegraph Company of Spokane,

Appellant,

539. vs.

E. V. Kuykendall, as Director of Public Works of Washington, et al., etc., et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record

from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Home Telephone and Telegraph Company of Spokane,
Appellant,
790. vs.
E. V. Kuykendall, as Director of Public Works of Washington, et al., etc., et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of New Mexico,
Complainant,
3, Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

On consideration of the motion to set this cause for hearing,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of New Mexico,
Complainant,
14, Original. vs.
The State of Colorado.

On consideration of the motion for leave to open the testimony and to set this cause for hearing,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Ex parte In the matter of the City of New York et al., Orig'l. Petitioners.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of prohibition and/or a writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Agent etc., Petitioner,
326. vs.
John O'Hara.

On consideration of the motion to substitute James C. Davis, as Agent of President Coolidge, as the party petitioner in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Agent etc., Petitioner,
114. vs.
The Portland Seed Company.

James C. Davis, Agent etc., Petitioner,
123. vs.
A. J. Parrington.

On consideration of the motion for a further consideration of this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alge Howell, Petitioner,
969. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Randolph Whitman, as Claimant etc., et al., Petitioners,
972. vs.
Bondholders Committee of December 1, 1921, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Dennison Brick & Tile Company, Petitioner,
976. vs.
Chicago Trust Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mary Brafman, Petitioner,
983. vs.
Benjamin Brafman et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Cleveland & Western Coal Company, Petitioner,
999. vs.
Main Island Creek Coal Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

ORDER. It is ordered by this Court that no petitions for writs of certiorari or motions, except motions for admission to practice, will be received after Monday, June 2d, and the Court will adjourn for the Term on Monday, June 9th.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Complainant,
16, Orig'l. vs.
The State of Washington.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Beck in that behalf, leave was granted to substitute an amended bill of complaint herein.

Margaret C. Lynch, Executrix etc., Plaintiff in Error,
488. vs.
Clara B. Congdon et al., Executors etc.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck in behalf of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America et al., Appellants,
912. vs.
Butterworth-Judson Corporation et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellants.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
993. vs.
Washington Market Company.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior,
Appellant,
1048. vs.
The United States of America ex rel. Chestatee Pyrites & Chemical Corporation.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the appellant.

Ephraim Lederer, Collector,
Petitioner,
995. vs.
The Real Estate Title Insurance & Trust Company of Philadelphia.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Beck for the petitioner, and by Mr. Maurice Bower Saul for the respondent.

Lorenz Reich, Plaintiff in Error,
562. vs.
Alexander Smith Cochran et al., etc., as Executors etc.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel Untermyer and Mr. Percy H. Stewart for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Alton B. Parker for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

The United States, Appellant,
938. vs.
Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland.

The motion to dismiss or affirm or advance in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Simon Lyon, Mr. R. B. H. Lyon, and Mr. W. S. Whitman for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr.

Solicitor General Beck and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Lovett for the appellant in opposition thereto.

Herman Wolff et al., Executors etc., Petitioners,
1046. vs.
John G. Williams.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Henry Butler in behalf of Mr. Hugh W. Ogden and Mr. Hollis R. Bailey for the petitioners, and by Mr. Mark W. Herblit for the respondent.

United States & Cuban Allied Works Engineering Corporation, Plaintiff in Error,
940. vs.
Lloyds, as Treasurer of Lloyds Underwriters Syndicate No. 601, et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hugh B. Rowland in behalf of Mr. Herbert Barry and Mr. Archibald G. Thatcher for the defendants in error in support of the motion.

Peter Sain et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
890. vs.
Cypress Creek Drainage District.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Stuart Lewis in behalf of Mr. Lamar Williamson for the plaintiffs in error in support of the petition; and motion to waive the rule as to submission of the petition was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Stuart Lewis in that behalf.

Wilson Clinton, an incompetent etc., Plaintiff in Error,
739. vs.
Gypsy Oil Company.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. B. Diggs for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Horace H. Hagan for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

The United States, Appellant,
227. vs.
James Reed.

The mandate in this cause was granted, on motion of Mr. George A. King for the appellee.

Denison-Pratt Paper Company, Petitioner,
576. vs.
News Publishing Company.

The supplemental petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clarence W. Dealtry, Mr. Charles D. Merrick, and Mr. Buford C. Tynes for the petitioner, and by Mr. C. M. Hanna for the respondent.

The City of New York et al., Appellants,
892. vs.
Lindley M. Garrison, as Receiver of New York Municipal Railway Corporation, etc., et al.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. B. F. Shipman in behalf of Mr. Charles P. Howland for the appellees in support of the motion, and by Mr. George P. Nicholson and Mr. William G. Fullen for the appellants in opposition thereto.

Ex parte In the matter of Philip Grossman,
Original. Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert A. Milroy for the petitioner.

E. R. Portuondeck, Petitioner,
806. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Will C. Austin and Mr. R. E. Taylor for the petitioner; and motion to waive rule as to submission of the petition herein submitted to the consideration of the Court.

Orinoco Company, Limited, et al., Appellants,
1018. vs.
The Orinoco Iron Company.

The motion to reinstate this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George H. Baxter for the appellants, and by Mr. William R. Harr and Mr. Edward S. Duvall in opposition thereto; with leave to the appellants to file a brief herein by Monday next.

The Western Pacific Railroad Company, Appellant,
815. vs.
The United States.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry C. Clark for the appellant.

North Pacific Steamship Company, Plaintiff in Error,
973. vs.
William T. Soley.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ernest Clewe for the plaintiff in error in support of the petition, and by Mr. Henry Heidelberg for the defendant in error in opposition thereto.

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Petitioner,
974. vs.
Anna N. Gill, Administratrix of the Estate of Glenn C. Gill, deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ralph J. Kramer, Mr. Edward C. Kramer, Mr. Bruce A. Campbell, Mr. Walter H. Mayne, Mr. Morison R. Waite, and Mr. William A. Eggers for the petitioner, and by Mr. Sidney Thorne Able and Mr. Charles P. Noell for the respondent.

Municipal Assembly of Arroyo, Porto Rico, Petitioner,
986. vs.
Successors of C.& J. Fantauzzi.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. B. Wilcox and Mr. C. Dominguez Rubio for the petitioner, and by Mr. Francois M. Beagle and Mr. Eugene Congleton for the respondent.

Juan Perez Cami, Municipal Commissioner of Finance, Petitioner,
987. vs.
Central Victoria, Limited.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. B. Wilcox and Mr. Juan B. Soto for the petitioner, and by Mr. Francis G. Caffey for the respondent.

B. W. Neal, Inc., et al., Petitioners, 989. vs. Alvin M. Powell et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted by Mr. James F. Terry for the petitioners, and by Mr. Joseph B. Jacobs for the respondents.

Commerce Trust Company, Petitioner, 994. vs. F. Alexander Chandler et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert G. Dodge and Mr. Harold S. Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Judd Dewey for the respondents.

Samuel T. Wiggins, Assignee, George P. Ide & Company, et al., Petitioners, 996. vs. F. E. Hummel, Receiver. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. N. McConnell for the petitioners.

W. A. Gentry, Petitioner, 998. vs. James C. Davis, Agent of the United States Government under the Transportation Act of 1920. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Stephens and Mr. Frank Doster for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. W. Brown and Mr. Alfred G. Armstrong for the respondent.

John Beal Sneed et al., Petitioners, 1006. vs. The United States of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James E. Gresham for the petitioners.

Frederick Keighley, Trustee of Locust Building Company, Inc., Bankrupt, Petitioner, 1007. vs. American Trust Company. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the

uel Silbiger for the petitioner, and by Mr. Morgan J. O'Brien for the respondent.

S. H. Pomeroy Company et al., Petitioners,
1009. vs.
Frank F. Smith Hardware Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William B. Greeley and Mr. William A. Redding for the petitioners, and by Mr. Stephen J. Cox for the respondent.

Emile Vital et al., Copartners etc., Petitioners,
1010. vs.
Henry F. Kerr, Trading as The Kerr Steamship Line.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. Catesby Jones and Mr. James W. Ryan for the petitioners, and by Mr. Elkan Turk for the respondent.

Isaac J. Bigio, Petitioner,
1011. vs.
Henry F. Kerr, Trading as The Kerr Steamship Line.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. Catesby Jones and Mr. James W. Ryan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Elkan Turk for the respondent.

R. H. Clemmer, Attorney in Fact for certain unsecured creditors, et al., Petitioners,
1017. vs.
Arthur L. Ross et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. H. Rumble for the petitioners, and by Mr. Randolph Hicks and Mr. Arthur Leonard Ross for the respondents.

Merriam & Millard Company, Petitioner,
1021. vs.
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration

of the Court by Mr. Edward P. Smith and Mr. Francis S. Howell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Bruce Scott, Mr. Byron Clark, and Mr. Kenneth F. Burgess for the respondent.

Elmyr A. Laughlin et al., Petitioners,
1024. vs.
Burry Railway Supply Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joshua R. H. Potts and Mr. Brayton G. Richards for the petitioners.

George W. Reed et al., Trustees in Bankruptcy of the Estate of Massachusetts Motors, Inc., Bankrupt,
Petitioners,
1025. vs.
Federal Finance Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George W. Reed for the petitioners, and by Mr. Alexander Britton for the respondent.

Chicago Pneumatic Tool Company,
Petitioner,
1027. vs.
William H. Keller, Inc., formerly known as Keller Pneumatic Tool Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Davis and Mr. Samuel E. Hibben for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward S. Rogers, Mr. George T. Buckingham, and Mr. Marquis Eaton for the respondent.

Guardian Savings & Trust Company, Trustee,
Petitioner,
1029. vs.
Road Improvement District No. 7 of Poinsett County, Arkansas.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. G. B. Rose, Mr. D. H. Cantrell, Mr. J. F. Loughborough, and Mr. A. D. Dobyns for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry D. Ashley for the respondent.

Rudolph De Marco, Petitioner,
1035. vs.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States

Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Moe Levy and Mr. Henry Bowden for the petitioner.

J. H. Hines Company, Inc., et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
519. vs.
Amet Guillat, Sheriff and Ex Officio Tax Collector of Arroyelles Parish, Louisiana.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. D. Wilkinson and Mr. C. H. Lewis for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Donelson Caffery and Mr. W. E. Couvillon for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

First National Bank of Guthrie Center, Iowa,
Plaintiff in Error,
722. vs.
L. B. Anderson, County Auditor of Guthrie County, Iowa, et al., etc.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ben J. Gibson and Mr. Maxwell A. O'Brien for the defendants inerror in support of the motion, and by Mr. J. G. Gamble for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Fort Smith Spelter Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
774. vs.
Clear Creek Oil & Gas Company.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph M. Hill and Mr. Henry L. Fitzhugh for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Tom M. Mehaffy and Mr. James W. Mehaffy for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Arkansas Natural Gas Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
407. vs.
W. N. McFarland, Supervisor of Public Accounts.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
15,
Original. vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant;
The United States, Intervener.

The answer to the rule to show cause of J. H. Duhon and H. J. Kebideaux was filed, on motion of Mr. A. H. Carrigan in that behalf.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
15,
Original. vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant;
The United States, Intervener.

The argument on suggestions, etc., was commenced by Mr. W. A. Ledbetter for the lessees; continued by Mr. A. H. Carrigan for certain patented land owners, by Mr. R. H. Ward for the Kirby Petroleum Company, a lessee; by Mr. W. W. Dyer for the United States of America, intervener; by Mr. E. P. Hill for the State of Oklahoma; by Mr. E. E. Blake and Mr. H. L. Cole for the Grand Oil & Developing Company, Inc.; by Mr. Leslie Humphrey for C. T. Taylor; by Mr. A. H. Carrigan for certain patented land owners; and concluded by Mr. W. A. Keeling for the State of Texas.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, June 2d next, at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Charles H. LeFevre, Esquire, of Dover, State of Delaware; and William B. Devoe, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin W. Smith, It is ordered that Frank L. McGuire, Esquire, of New London, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom D. McKeown, it is ordered that Charles B. Wilson, Jr., Esquire, of Pawhuska, State of Oklahoma; and Paul N. Humphrey, Esquire, of Pawhuska, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wayne B. Wheeler, It is ordered that Edward B. Dunford, Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander Britton, It is ordered that William C. Achi, Jr., Esquire, of Lihue, Kauai, Territory of Hawaii; and William H. Beers, Esquire, of Hilo, Territory of Hawaii, be admitted to practice as an Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis J. Behan, It is ordered that William J. Corrigan, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois; and Charles M. Goodnow, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois; be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Leonard Biel, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York; Eustace Smith, Esquire, of Hutchinson, State of Kansas; Jerome C. Jackson, of New York City, State of New York; and Donald W. Sessions, Esquire, of Lansing, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alex. T. Vogelsang, It is ordered that Maurice E. Harrison, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sidney R. Prince, It is ordered that Charles Lowrey Garnett, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Mississippi; and William M. Walker, Esquire, of Birmingham, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Haines H. Hargrett, It is ordered that J. Robert Sherrod, Esquire, of Fort Wayne, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Timothy T. Amberry, It is ordered that Richard H. Sutphen, Esquire, of Defiance, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard H. Elliott, It is ordered that Frank Gardner, Esquire, of Scottsburg, State of Indiana; and Arthur H. Greenwood, Esquire, of Washington, State of Indiana; and Samuel R. Cook, Esquire, of Huntington, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stuart Lewis, It is ordered that Lester Wood, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; and Richard V. Mattingly, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Thomson Spot Welder Company,
Petitioner,
120. vs.
Ford Motor Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
569. vs.
Ninety-five Barrels, more or less, Alleged Apple Cider Vinegar, Douglas Packing Company, Claimant.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and

was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission,

Appellants,

666. vs.

American Railway Express Company and Seaboard Air Line Railway Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Southeastern Express Company,

Appellant,

667. vs.

American Railway Express Company and Seaboard Air Line Railway Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Southern Traffic League, Atlanta Freight Bureau, and Southern Fisheries Association,

Appellants,

668. vs.

American Railway Express Company and Seaboard Air Line Railway Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Pacific Gas & Electric Company,

Appellant,

34. vs.

The City and County of San Francisco.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for such further proceedings as the circumstances may require, including another reference to the master if deemed advisable.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Brandeis,

Mr. Justice Holmes.

Pacific Gas & Electric Company,

Appellant,

35. vs.

The City and County of San Francisco and James Rolph, Jr., Mayor of said City and County.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for such further proceedings as the circumstances may require, including another reference to the master if deemed advisable.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Mr. Justice Holmes.

Pacific Gas & Electric Company,

Appellant,

36. vs.

The City and County of San Francisco and James Rolph, Jr., Mayor of said City and County.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for such further proceedings as the circumstances may require, including another reference to the master if deemed advisable.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Brandeis,

Mr. Justice Holmes.

Waldemar Gnerich and Jeremiah T. Regan, Co-partners doing business under the firm name and style of B. & S. Drug Company,

Appellants,

79. vs.

S. F. Rutter, as Prohibition Director in and for the District of California.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California with directions to dismiss the bill for want of a necessary party.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

I. Goto, H. Miyazawa, K. Takizawa, et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
465. John C. Lane, High Sheriff of the Territory of Hawaii.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Hawaii.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Hawaii, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Wesley Hetrick,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
231. Village of Lindsey, Frank E. Seigenthaler, Auditor of Sandusky County, and Henry P. Setzler, Treasurer of Sandusky County.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
Announced by Mr. Justice McKenna.

Mr. Justice McKenna announced the following orders of the Court:

Ex parte In the matter of Philip Grossman, 30, Original. Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and a rule to show cause is ordered to issue returnable on Monday, October 6th next.

It is further ordered that the petitioner herein be, and he is hereby, admitted to bail upon the furnishing of bond in the sum of Five thousand dollars.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte In the matter of Philip Grossman, 30, Original. Petitioner.

On petition for a writ of habeas corpus.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

It is further ordered that a rule issue to Richey V. Graham, Superintendent of the House of Corrections of Chicago, Cook County, Illinois, directing him to show cause before this Court on or before Monday, October 6, 1924, why the prayer of the petition should not be granted.

It is further ordered that the petitioner, Philip Grossman, be admitted to bail pending the consideration and disposal of this cause in this Court, upon condition that he give a bond in the penal sum of $5,000.00 with surety to be approved by the Clerk of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois and conditioned for his appearance and surrender pursuant to the ultimate order of this Court in said cause, and for his obedience to that order and any intervening order in the cause which this Court may make.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The United States of America et al., Appellants, vs. Butterworth-Judson Corporation et al.

912.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby,

granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior,
Appellant,
1048. vs.
The United States of America ex rel. Chestate Pyrites & Chemical Corporation.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,
It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 10th next, with No. 783.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Western Pacific Railroad Company, Appellant,
813. vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,
It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 10th next, with case No. 810.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lorenz Rich, Plaintiff in Error,
562. vs.
Alexander Smith Cochran et al., etc., as Executors etc.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wilson Clinton, an Incompetent, by Edmond Hill, his next friend and Guardian, et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
739. vs.
Gypsy Oil Company.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The City of New York et al.,
Appellants,
892. vs.
Lindley M. Garrison, as Receiver of New York Municipal Railway Corporation, etc., et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Appellant,
938. vs.
Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland.

On consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

It is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, advanced and assigned for argument on the summary docket on Monday, November 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. H. Hines Company, Inc., et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
319. vs.
Amet Guillot, Sheriff etc.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

First National Bank of Guthrie Center, Plaintiff in Error,
723. vs.
L. B. Anderson, County Auditor of Guthrie County, Iowa, et al., etc.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Port Spelter Company, Plaintiff in Error,
774. vs.
Clear Creek Oil & Gas Company.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fulton National Bank of Atlanta, Petitioner,
750. vs.
I. S. Hoosier et al., Receivers of Imbrie Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Agent etc., Petitioner,
785. vs.
L. D. Alexander et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit

to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Municipal Assembly of Arroyo, Porto Rico,
Petitioner,
986. vs.
Successors of C. and J. Fantauzzi.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Juan Perez Cami, Municipal Commissioner of Finance,
Petitioner,
987. vs.
Central Victoria, Limited.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dennison-Pratt Paper Company,
Petitioner,
576. vs.
News Publishing Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

H. H. Portschock,
Petitioner,
806. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Peter Sain et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
890. vs.
Cypress Creek Drainage District.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Railway Company et al.,
Petitioners,
943. vs.
Josephine C. Kepler.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

B. W. Neal, Inc., et al.,
Petitioners,
989. vs.
Alvin M. Powell et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Commerce Trust Company,
Petitioner,
994. vs.
Alexander Chandler et al., Co-Receivers.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ephraim Lederer, Collector,
995. vs.
The Real Estate Title Insurance & Trust Company of Philadelphia.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel T. Wiggins, Assignee, et al.,
Petitioners,
996. vs.
F. E. Hummel, Receiver.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. A. Gentry, Petitioner,
998. vs.
James C. Davis, Agent.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Beal Sneed et al., Petitioners,
1006. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frederick Keighley, Trustee of Locust Building Company, Inc., Bankrupt,
Petitioner,
1007. vs.
American Trust Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

R. Asakura, Plaintiff in Error,
211. vs.
The City of Seattle et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

ORDER. It is ordered by this Court that the opinion heretofore filed be amended by inserting near the end thereof and immediately after

the sentence "The ordinance violates the treaty", the following: "The question in the present case relates solely to Japanese subjects who have been admitted to this country. We do not pass upon the right of admission or the construction of the treaty in this respect, as that question is not before us and would require consideration of other matters with which it is not now necessary to deal."

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

B. I. Salinger, Jr., Appellant,
341. vs.
Victor Loisel, United States Marshal.

B. I. Salinger, Jr., Appellant,
342. vs.
Victor Loisel, United States Marshal.

B. I. Salinger, Jr., Petitioner,
705. vs.
Victor Loisel, United States Marshal.

It is ordered by this Court that the judgments of May 26th, 1924, in these cases, be, and the same are hereby, amended by adding thereto the following, "or, in the alternative, that he surrender himself within such ten days into the custody of the Marshal for the District of South Dakota at some place within that District, to be dealt with according to law". The mandates heretofore issued are recalled, and new ones will issue forthwith bearing the date of those first issued and conforming to the original judgmentsas here amended. The last paragraph of the opinion in these cases will be amended by adding the same alternative clause to it.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward H. Childs, Trustee in Bankruptcy,
Petitioner,
992. vs.
The United States of America.

The suggestion to strike the petition for a writ of certiorari herein from the docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the respondent.

The United States of America ex rel. Soo Hoo Hong,
Petitioner,
454. vs.
Robert E. Tod, Commissioner of Immigration etc.

The suggestion to strike the petition for a writ of certiorari herein from the docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the respondent.

The United States of America ex rel. Joseph Singleton, next friend of Lui Kah,

Petitioner,

482. vs.

Robert E. Tod, Commissioner of Immigration.

The suggestion to strike the petition for a writ of certiorari herein from the docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the respondent.

The United States of America,

Petitioner,

1033. vs.

New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, Mr. Solicitor General Beck, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Davis, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the petitioner, and by Mr. John Tilney Carpenter for the respondent.

Brooks-Scanlon Corporation,

Appellant,

367. vs.

The United States.

The motion for leave to file a petition for rehearing herein within sixty days was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for The United States in support of the motion, and by Mr. George A. King in behalf of counsel for Brooks-Scanlon Corporation in opposition thereto.

The United States, Appellant,

385. vs.

Brooks-Scanlon Corporation.

Realty Holding Company, Appellant,

929. vs.

Lavina B. Donaldson.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court, without prejudice, by Mr. L. B. Gardner, Mr. Sidney T. Miller, Mr. George L. Canfield, Mr. John C. Spaulding, Mr. Harold H. Emmons, Mr. Frank L. Dodge, and Mr. Robert M. Dipsdale, for the appellee in support of the motion; with leave to counsel for the plaintiff in error to file a brief in opposition thereto on or before Monday next.

The United States, Appellant,

447. vs.

The Supplee-Biddle Hardware Company.

The mandate in this cause was granted, on motion of Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., for the appellee.

Catherine G. Branan, Jr., an Infant, etc., Petitioner,
1077. vs.
William A. Wimsatt, Trading as Johnson & Wimsatt.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. T. Taliaferro for the petitioner.

Cranberry Creek Coal Company, Plaintiff in Error,
900. vs.
The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Alliance Coal Mining Company, Plaintiff in Error,
901. vs.
The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The Lehigh Coal & Navigation Company, Plaintiff in Error,
902. vs.
The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron Company, Plaintiff in Error,
903. vs.
The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George W. Woodruff for the defendant in error.

Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error,
1076. vs.
Texas & Pacific Railway Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander Britton in that behalf.

Fleischmann Construction Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
979. vs.
The United States of America to the use of G. W. Forsberg et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bynum E. Hinton for the defendants in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Levi H. David and Mr. William F. Kimber for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Compagnie Internationale de Produits Alimentaires, S. A., Appellant,
1061. vs.
Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian, etc., et al.

The motion to advance was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. B. Ellis for the appellant.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
15,
Original. vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant;
The United States, Intervener.

The motion of the defendant for leave to file an amended counter-claim herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas W. Gregory for the defendant, and by Mr. Will G. Hill for the complainant in opposition thereto.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
15,
Original. vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant;
The United States, Intervener.

The motion of the defendant for leave to file a request of The State of Texas that the Receiver pay the gross production tax due the State of Texas upon the oil produced in Texas during the Receivership, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas W. Gregory for the defendant.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
15,
Original. vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant;
The United States, Intervener.

The motion of Thomas A. Gall, Trustee, for permission to file requests for instructions to the Receiver to turn over impounded money to be distributed as to Well No. 160, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas W. Gregory in that behalf.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
15,
Original. vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant;
The United States, Intervener.

The motion of Mueller Petroleum Company for leave to intervene herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. A. Ledbetter, Mr. H. L. Stuart, and Mr. R. H. Bell in that behalf.

Louisville Bedding Company,
Appellant,
1022. vs.
The United States.

The motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims for further findings was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson for the appellant; with leave to counsel for the appellee to file a brief herein in opposition thereto on or before Thursday next.

United Gas & Electric Engineering Corporation, Appellant,
1060. vs.
The United States.

The motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims for further findings was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson

for the appellant; with leave to counsel for the appellee to file a brief herein in opposition thereto on or before Thursday next.

Robins Dry Dock & Repair Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
870. vs.
Lars Dahl.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ralph G. Barclay for the defendant in error.

The Palmer Brothers Company,
Appellant,
1050. vs.
D. E. Weaver, Chief of the Bureau of Inspection in Pittsburgh of the Department of Labor and Industry, etc.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank T. McGuire in that behalf.

The State of Michigan, Complainant,
25, Original. vs.
The State of Wisconsin.

The motion for the appointment of a Commissioner herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. L. Sawyer for the complainant.

The Sanitary District of Chicago,
Appellant,
529. vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of counsel for The States of Michigan, Wisconsin, Ohio, Indiana, and Pennsylvania, leave was granted to file a brief herein as amici curiae.

Ex parte In the matter of Julius Shapiro and Samuel J. Smith, Individually and as Copartners doing business as Shapiro & Company, Bankrupts,
——, Original. Petitioners.

The motion for a stay herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jerome C. Jackson for the petitioners.

Twohy Brothers Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
1002. vs.
Clarence Kennedy.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. H. Benton in behalf of Mr. W. T. Sprowls for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. E. C. Brandenburg, Mr. G. P. Bullard, and [illegible] for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Great International Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers,
Plaintiff in Error,
738. vs.
J. W. Green.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. T. Stokely for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. J.J. Mayfield for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Samuel S. Lewis et al.,
Petitioners,
1000. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harvey H. Pratt for the petitioners.

Mrs. F. W. Leatherbury, Community Administratrix,
Petitioner,
1001. vs.
Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Third Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Winbourn Pearce and Mr. A. L. Curtis for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. W. Terry for the respondent.

Great Northern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
1008. vs.
Charles W. Reed et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. G. Dorety for the petitioner.

Charles Sherwin et al., Petitioners,
1012. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. B. Scott for the petitioners.

Leda K. Mayfield, Petitioner,
1015. vs.
The Equitable Trust Company of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the considera-

tion of the Court by Mr. S. G. Mayfield for the petitioner, and by Mr. Alfred Huger for the respondent.

Leda K. Mayfield, Petitioner,
1016. vs.
The Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. G. Mayfield for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hollins N. Randolph and Mr. A. B. Lovett for the respondent.

Fred S. Hoback, Petitioner,
1030. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. B. Hunt and Mr. Walter R. Staples for the petitioner.

American Central Insurance Company, Petitioner,
1034. vs.
Mrs. G. W. Sims.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. Lee Bartels for the petitioner.

Diamond Coal & Coke Company, Petitioner,
1039. vs.
Hazelwood Dock Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward B. Burling for the petitioner.

Diamond Coal & Coke Company, Petitioner,
1040. vs.
Hazelwood Dock Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward R. Burling for the petitioner.

American Creosote Works, Inc., et al., Petitioners,
1041. vs.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the

consideration of the Court by Mr. William B. Grant and Mr. Charlton R. Beattie for the petitioners.

Landers Company, Inc., et al., Petitioners,
1049. vs.
Lincoln-Alliance Bank.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. J. Howard and Mr. Sewall Myer for the petitioners.

Commercial National Bank of Hutchinson, Kansas, Petitioner,
1054. vs.
Heid Brothers, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Eighth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. I. M. Watson and Mr. Charles R. Loomis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Joseph U. Sweeney for the respondent.

Irving National Bank, etc., Petitioner,
1062. vs.
Thomas M. Blake et al., Receivers.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Irving L. Ernst for the petitioner, and by Mr. Herman Aaron for the respondents.

Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company, Petitioner,
1063. vs.
Ernest J. Goneau.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Marshall A. Spooner and Mr. John E. Palmer for the petitioner, and by Mr. Samuel A. Anderson for the respondent.

Forestglen Land Company, Petitioner,
1065. vs.
George R. Scrugham et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter L. Clark and Mr. M. W. Acheson, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. Leo Weil for the respondent.

Joe R. Irwin, Petitioner,
1066. vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Huling P. Robertson, Jr., for the petitioner.

J. G. White & Company, Inc., Petitioner,
1069. vs.
Ball Engineering Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Kemp Bartlett and Mr. Harry W. Reynolds for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles D. Lockwood and Mr. William M. Parke for the respondent.

James C. Davis, Director General and Agent etc., Petitioner,
1071. vs.
John L. Roper Lumber Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. A. McLaughlin for the petitioner.

Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian, et al., Petitioners,
1073. vs.
Benjamin Guinness et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Peck for the petitioners.

Benjamin Guinness et al., Petitioners,
1074. vs.
Thomas W. Miller, Alien Property Custodian, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander B. Siegel for the petitioners.

Chicago Great Western Railroad Company, Petitioner,
1075. vs.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota was submitted to the consideration of the

for the petitioner, and by Mr. Tom Davis and Mr. Ernest A. Michel for the respondent.

W. W. Wilkinson, Trustee etc., Petitioner,
1079. vs.
J. L. Walker.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Mark McMahon for the petitioner.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
15, Original. vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant; The United States, Intervener.

The Report of the Commissioners as to time employed and expense incurred in surveying and mapping medial line of Red River in vicinity of river bed oil wells was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur D. Kidder and Mr. Arthur A. Stiles for the Commissioners herein.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, JUNE 9, 1924.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
William R. Stansbury, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick C. Bryan, It is ordered that Jesse P. Dice, Esquire, of Akron, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Adrien F. Busick, It is ordered that Vernon W. Van Fleet, Esquire, of South Bend, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Challin B. Ellis, It is ordered that Charles F. Dolle, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis C. Crampton, It is ordered that Robert M. Drysdale, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan; and John R. Rood, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. H. Rumble, It is ordered that Frank C. Miller, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert G. Simmons, It is ordered that William Morrow, Esquire, of Scottsbluff, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, It is ordered that Alberto S. Poventud, Esquire, of Ponce, Porto Rico; and Barry S. Ulrich, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alva B. Adams, It is ordered that Joseph P. O'Connell, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh B. Rowland, It is ordered that Richard H. Wilmer, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, It is ordered that Sidney C. Murray, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Robert C. Hilldale, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Pauline M. Floyd, It is ordered that William E. Chapman, Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William N. Vaile, It is ordered that Samuel Dickstein, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Melville D. Church, It is ordered that William G. Mahaffy, Esquire, of Wilmington, State of Delaware, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tench T. Marye, It is ordered that Will T. Gordon, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; C. Dudley Shreve, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, Raymond F. Church, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California; Albert R. Killgore, Esquire, of Glendale, State of California, and James Neil Hastings, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

James Everard's Breweries,

Appellant,

200. vs.

Ralph A. Day, Prohibition Director of the State of New York, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Edward and John Burke, Limited,
Appellant,
245. vs.
David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

The United States of America et al., Appellants,
627. vs.
The New River Company et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Slab Fork Coal Company et al.,
Appellants,
628. vs.
New River Company et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this

cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Dissenting: Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Mr. Justice McKenna.

The Idaho Irrigation Company, Limited, et al., Appellants, vs. Fred W. Gooding et al. 324. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Idaho.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Fred W. Gooding et al., Appellants, vs. The Idaho Irrigation Company, Limited, et al. 336. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Idaho for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

William R. Warner & Company,
Petitioner,
32. vs.
Eli Lilly & Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
358. vs.
Title Insurance & Trust Company et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

J. C. Walton, Appellant,
689. vs.
Wesley D. Disney et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record

from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

No. 15, Original.—October Term, 1923.

State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
vs.
State of Texas, Defendant, the United States, Intervener.

[June 9, 1924.]

On consideration of the report of the commissioners, heretofore selected to run, locate and mark portions of the boundary between the States of Texas and Oklahoma along the south bank of the Red River, showing that they have run, located and marked the portion of such boundary along the Big Bend Area, such report being as follows:

(The Clerk will here insert the complete report.)

And on consideration of the exceptions presented to such report and of the protests made against the same:

It is now adjudged, ordered and decreed that the exceptions and protests be overruled and that the report be in all respects confirmed.

It is further adjudged, ordered and decreed that the line delineated and set forth in the report and on the maps accompanying the same and referred to therein be established and declared to be the true boundary between the States of Texas and Oklahoma along the part of the Red River designated in such report, subject however to such changes as may hereafter be wrought by the natural and gradual processes known as erosion and accretion as specified in the second, third and fourth paragraphs of the decree rendered herein March 12, 1923, 261 U. S. 340.

It is further ordered that the Clerk of this Court do transmit to the Chief Magistrates of the States of Texas and Oklahoma copies of this decree, duly authenticated under the seal of this Court, together with copies of the maps which accompanied the report of the commissioners.



Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
APR 17 1924
WM. R. STANSBURY
Clerk

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1923

No. 15, Original

COMPLAINANT,

vs.

THE STATE OF [illegible], DEFENDANT,
[illegible] INTERVENER

REPORT OF THE [illegible] COMMISSIONERS

ARTHUR D. HILLER,
ARTHUR A. STILES,
Commissioners.

[illegible], D. C., April [illegible], 1924.

[illegible], Washington, D. C.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

October Term, 1923.

No. 15, Original.

THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA, Complainant,

vs.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Defendant; THE UNITED STATES, Intervener.

REPORT OF THE BOUNDARY COMMISSIONERS.

To the Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States:

As commissioners designated in the decree of March 12, 1923, in the above entitled cause, we have run, located and marked upon the ground the boundary between the States of Texas and Oklahoma along the Red River in what is known as the Big Bend Area (Area "A") in accordance with that decree and the principles announced in the opinion delivered January 15, 1923, and we have the honor to submit the following joint report respecting that part of our work, with field notes and maps.

Paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 of the decree follow:

"5. The south bank of the river is the water-washed and relatively permanent elevation or acclivity, commonly called a cut bank, along the southerly side of the river which separates its bed from the adjacent upland, whether valley or hill, and usually serves to confine the waters within the bed and to preserve the course of the river.

6. The boundary between the two States is on and along that bank at the mean level attained by the waters of the river when they reach and wash the bank without overflowing it.

7. At exceptional places where there is no well defined cut bank, but only a gradual incline from the sand bed of the river to the upland, the boundary is a line over such incline conforming to the mean level of the waters when at other places in that vicinity they reach and wash the cut bank without overflowing it."

The foregoing specifications applied in the light of the opinion, admit of, and require the exercise of practical judgment in determining the line intended; but certain fundamentals, such as the following, obviously must form the final basis for the exact location of the line.

The boundary line is a gradient of the flowing water in the river. It is located midway between the lower level of the flowing water that just reaches the cut bank, and the higher level of it that just does not overtop the cut bank. The physical top of the cut bank being very uneven in profile, cannot be a datum for locating the boundary line; but a gradient along the bank must be used for that

purpose. The highest point on the gradient most ne
than the lowest acceptable point on the bank in that vi
boundary line has been determined accordingly.

We have marked the boundary line by wooden posts
ness posts" set along the bank at varying short distanc
boundary, and from each other. A bearing and distan
taken from each witness post to one or more points on th

Permanent reference monuments are located at va
vals on the Texas bluff overlooking the river valley.
manent reference monuments are located on the Okla
and these overlook the river valley.

By accurate surveys the witness posts are joined to
and to the monuments on the Texas bluff. Similarly
monuments are joined to each other and to the
monuments, which in turn, are joined to each other
witness posts. Permanent bench marks located near th
are also joined to the witness posts and to the reference

All oil wells within three hundred feet of the bou
been accurately located upon the ground, and the post
whether in Texas or in Oklahoma, is stated. From e
a bearing and distance is given to a point on the boundar

The boundary line is shown by the usual symbol and
wording on the accompanying maps, which also show
of the witness posts, the oil wells, the reference mon
bench marks and other information usually appearing
maps. These maps are made part of this report and n
as follows:

Map No. 1: Cadastral Map of the Big Bend Area, sca
to the inch.

Map No. 2: Cadastral Map of the oil field region, in
Nos. 1 and 2, scale 500 feet to the inch

Map No. 3: Topographic Map of the Big Bend A
sheets, Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4, scale 500 feet
contour interval 2 feet.

The survey was begun April 16, 1923, and comple
17, 1924. The location of the boundary, reported here
position which existed on December 31, 1923.

The surveying has been done with painstaking ca
ance with approved modern methods. The results ha
jected to one or more tests to verify their accuracy. T
have been reduced to the minimum, consistent with
record of the boundary location.

The geographic positions are on the standard d
United States Coast and Geodetic Survey; the datum
tions is mean sea level.

The field notes of the boundary, location of oil w
tion of reference monuments and witness posts, and
muths, distances, geographic positions and sea lev
follow:

TRAVERSE OF WITNESS POSTS AND CONNECTIONS TO BOUNDARY AND REFERENCE MONUMENTS

Beginning at Reference Monument No. 1 on the Texas bluff, as such monument is hereinafter defined, thence North, on an extension of the east line of Range 13 West in Oklahoma, 2138.2 ft. (32.397 chs.) to Witness Post "O." This point is on the flood plain within the river valley 455 ft. south of the top of the cut bank. The bank is well defined.

Thence from Witness Post "O," with traverse of witness posts and connections to the boundary bank

Bearing.	Distance.	Witness post.	Connections to the boundary.
N. 41° 19′ W.	915.0 ft., or 13.864 chs.,	to W. P. 0 plus 1;	N. 38° 30′ E., 290 ft. N. 10° 30′ W., 313 "
N. 32° 21′ W.	706.2 ft., or 10.700 chs.	" " 2;	N. 45° E., 23 "
N. 46° 34′ W.	436.3 ft., or 6.610 chs.	" " 3;	N. 20° E., 17 "
N. 68° 26′ W.	734.7 ft., or 11.131 chs.	" " 4;	N. 40° E., 70 "
N. 54° 36′ W.	1006.4 ft., or 15.248 chs.	" " 5;	N. 40° 30′ E., 205 "
N. 33° 42′ W.	1080.8 ft., or 16.467 chs.	" " 6;	N. 40° E., 22 "
N. 39° 11′ W.	444.4 ft., or 6.733 chs.	" " 7;	N. 45° E., 11 "
N. 48° 26′ W.	1434.4 ft., or 21.733 chs.	" " 8;	N. 45° E., 29 "
N. 40° 00′ W.	1591.4 ft., or 24.112 chs.	" " 9;	N. 45° E., 14 "
N. 41° 21′ W.	373.1 ft., or 5.653 chs.	" " 10;	N. 45° E., 3 "

TRAVERSE OF WITNESS POSTS AND CONNECTIONS—Continued

From W. P. 10, Reference Monument No. 2 bears S. 14° 26' W., 340.2 ft. (5.155 chs.) dist.; thence from W. P. 10

Bearing.	Distance.	Witness post.	Connections to the boundary.	
N. 54° 54' W.	493.6 ft., 7.479 chs.	to W. P. 11;	N. 45° E.,	6 ft.
N. 58° 55' W.	1648.0 ft., 24.970 chs.	" " 12;	N. 45° E.,	6 "
N. 63° 06' W.	567.7 ft., 8.601 chs.	" " 13;	N. 45° E.,	2 "
N. 46° 43' W.	555.7 ft., 8.420 chs.	" " 14;	N. 45° E.,	12 "
N. 41° 15' W.	682.1 ft., 10.335 chs.	" " 15;	N. 45° E.,	21 "
N. 46° 26' W.	527.1 ft., 7.986 chs.	" " 16;	N. 45° E.,	9 "
N. 52° 44' W.	521.7 ft., 7.904 chs.	to W. P. 17;	N. 45° E.,	10 ft.

From W. P. 17, Reference Monument No. 3 bears S. 52° 55' W., 166.9 ft. (2.529 chs.) dist.; thence from W.

P. 17

N. 53° 19′ W.	373.3 ft., 5.656 chs.	to W. P. 18;	N. 45° E., 12 ft.
N. 48° 57′ W.	523.4 ft., 7.930 chs.,	" " 19;	N. 45° E., 18 " N. 10° E., 240 "
N. 27° 53′ W.	565.3 ft., 8.565 chs.	" " 20;	N. 45° E., 296 "
N. 33° 10′ W.	829.3 ft., 12.565 chs.	" " 21;	N. 72° 30′ E., 324 "
N. 21° 24′ W.	361.0 ft., 5.470 chs.	" " 22;	N. 83° 30′ E., 327 "
N. 5° 54′ W.	271.7 ft., 4.117 chs.,	" " 23;	N. 75° E., 268 " N. 10° E., 448 "
N. 45° 59′ W.	930.3 ft., 14.096 chs.,	" " 23 plus 1;	N. 22° 30′ E., 370 " North, 362 "
N. 44° 09′ W.	774.8 ft., 11.740 chs.	" " 23 plus 2;	N. 39° E., 373 "
N. 22° 07′ W.	874.8 ft., 13.255 chs.,	" " 23 plus 3;	N. 40° 30′ E., 289 " N. 17° W., 299 "
N. 52° 22′ W.	951.1 ft., 14.411 chs.	" " 23 plus 4;	N. 47° 45′ E., 316 "
N. 5° 27′ W.	482.5 ft., 7.310 chs.	" " 34;	N. 45° E., 4 "
N. 28° 07′ W.	672.1 ft., 10.183 chs.	" " 35;	N. 68° E., 120 "
N. 2° 29′ W.	154.2 ft., 2.336 chs.	" " 36;	N. 45° E., 18 "

TRAVERSE OF WITNESS POSTS AND CONNECTIONS—Continued

From W. P. 36, Reference Monument No. 4 bears S. 83° 00′ 50″ W., 4308.1 ft. (65.274 chs.) dist.; thence from W. P. 36

Bearing.	Distance.	Witness post.	Connections to the boundary.
N. 78° 01′ W.	619.9 ft., 9.392 chs.,	to W. P. 36 plus 1;	N. 70° 30′ E., 240 ft. N. 9° 15′ E., 303 "
N. 39° 53′ W.	896.1 ft., 13.578 chs.,	" " 36 plus 2;	N. 38° 30′ E., 324 "
N. 16° 42′ W.	675.3 ft., 10.232 chs.,	" " 36 plus 3;	N. 33° 15′ E., 242 "
N. 45° 07′ W.	537.3 ft., 8.141 chs.,	" " 36 plus 4;	N. 29° 30′ E., 310 "
N. 21° 49′ W.	561.0 ft., 8.500 chs.,	" " 36 plus 5;	N. 77° E., 110 "
N. 48° 12′ W.	792.5 ft., 12.007 chs.,	" " 36 plus 6;	N. 44° 15′ E., 230 "
N. 23° 26′ W.	945.7 ft., 14.329 chs.,	" " 36 plus 7;	N. 20° 15′ E., 165 "
N. 54° 44′ W.	776.7 ft., 11.768 chs.,	" " 36 plus 8;	N. 50° 30′ E., 361 "
N. 57° 19′ W.	734.6 ft.,	" " 36 plus 9;	N. 32° 40′ E., 364 "

N. 50° 15′ W.	899.3 ft. (18.626 chs.)	"	" 51;	N. 45° E.,	5 "
N. 41° 06′ W.	348.2 ft. (5.276 chs.)	"	" 52;	N. 45° E.,	5 "
N. 56° 33′ W.	146.8 ft. (2.224 chs.)	"	" 53;	N. 45° E.,	37 "
N. 42° 20′ W.	289.3 ft. (4.384 chs.)	"	" 54;	N. 45° E.,	10 "
N. 58° 22′ W.	185.8 ft. (2.815 chs.)	"	" 55;	N. 40° E.,	28 "

From W. P. 55, Reference Monument No. 6 bears S. 70° 56′ W., 719.8 ft. (10.906 chs.) dist.; thence from W. P. 55

N. 63° 08′ W.	1153.5 ft. (17.477 chs.),	to W. P. 55 plus 1;		N. 60° 45′ E., North,	321 ft. 281 "
N. 64° 05′ W.	797.5 ft. (12.084 chs.)	"	" 55 plus 2;	N. 46° 30′ E.,	419 "
N. 52° 24′ W.	746.8 ft. (11.316 chs.)	"	" 55 plus 3;	N. 30° 15′ E.,	398 "
N. 66° 09′ W.	1122.9 ft. (17.014 chs.)	"	" 55 plus 4;	N. 50° E.,	462 "
N. 1° 27′ E.	424.6 ft. (0.434 chs.)	"	" 63;	N. 30° E.,	23 "

TRAVERSE OF WITNESS POSTS AND CONNECTIONS—Continued

Thence from W. P. "55 plus 4"

Bearing.	Distance.	Witness post.	Connections to the boundary.
N. 49° 31′ W.	1088.5 ft., to W. P. 63 plus 1;	N. 67° 15′ E.,	276 ft.
N. 84° 16′ W.	16.492 chs.		
N. 86° 50′ W.	1053.5 ft., " " 63 plus 2;	N. 67° 15′ E.,	534 "
	15.962 chs.	N. 38° 45′ W.,	375 "
N. 21° 12′ W.	1149.0 ft., " " 63 plus 3;	N. 43° E.,	530 "
	17.423 chs.		
N. 56° 24′ W.	778.2 ft., " " 68;	N. 45° E.,	2 "
	11.701 chs.		
	491.4 ft., " " 69;	N. 45° E.,	20 "
	7.445 chs.		

From W. P. 69, Reference Monument No. 5 bears S. 17° 15′ 20″ E., 7908.8 ft. (119.830 chs.) dist.; Reference Monument No. 7 bears S. 50° 43′ 20″ W., 5372.3 ft. (81.398 chs.) dist; thence from W. P. 69

N. 36° 20′ W.	803.6 ft., to W. P. 70;	N. 45° E.,	28 ft.
	12.176 chs.		
N. 88° 43′ W.	682.4 ft., " " 70 plus 1;	N. 21° 45′ E.,	382 "
	10.340 chs.	N. 23° 30′ W.,	980 "

S. 86° 54' W.	1067.6 ft., 16.176 chs.	"	"	70 plus 2;	N. 42° 30' W., 753 "
N. 30° 59' E.	1077.5 ft., 16.326 chs.	"	"	70 plus 3;	
	575.5 ft., 8.720 chs.	"	"	78;	N. 15° W., 10 "

S 77° 21' W.	330.5 ft., 5.008 chs	"	"	79,	North, 12 "
S. 88° 22' W.	500.0 ft., 7.576 chs.	"	"	80;	N. 10° W., 8 "
S 77° 19' W.	338.7 ft., 5.132 chs	"	"	81;	North, 27 "

From W. P. 81, Reference Monument No. 7 bears South, 4400.4 ft. (66.674 chs.) dist.; thence from W. P. 81

S. 75° 21' W.	1113.3 ft., 16.869 chs.	to W. P. 81 plus 1;	N. 25° W.,	160 ft.
			N. 60° 15' W.,	713 "

Witness Post "81 plus 1" is the same as Bench Mark No. 2; thence from W. P. "81 plus 1"

N 64° 37' W.	1730.0 ft., 26.213 chs.	to W. P. 85;	N. 26° E.,	12 ft.

TRAVERSE OF WITNESS POSTS AND CONNECTIONS—Continued

From W. P. 85, Reference Monument No. 7 bears S. 28° 30′ 30″ E., 5529.3 ft. (83.777 chs.) dist.; Reference Monument No. 8 bears S. 30° 30′ 00″ W., 4185.1 ft. (63.411 chs.) dist.; thence from W. P. 85

Bearing.	Distance.	Witness post.	Connections to the boundary.	
N. 63° 50′ W.	618.4 ft., 9.370 chs.	to W. P. 86;	N. 10° E.,	9 ft.
N. 79° 47′ W.	242.2 ft., 3.670 chs.	" " 87;	N. 22° E.,	15 "
N. 67° 58′ W.	224.7 ft., 3.405 chs.	" " 88;	N. 35° E.,	4 "
N. 54° 44′ W.	222.7 ft., 3.374 chs.	" " 89;	N. 45° E.,	14 "
			N. 16° W.,	170 "
			N. 2° 30′ E.,	360 "
N. 17° 40′ W.	673.6 ft., 10.206 chs.	" " 90;	N. 80° E.,	203 "
N. 21° 17′ W.	520.5 ft., 7.886 chs.	" " 91;	N. 86° E.,	304 "
N. 42° 59′ W.	1143.7 ft., 17.329 chs.	" " 92;	S. 86° E.,	630 "
			N. 70° E.,	485 "
N. 20° 18′ W.	390.3 ft., 5.914 chs.	" " 93;	N. 88° E.,	529 "

N. 15° 08' E.	323.1 ft.,	"	" 94;	S. 62° E.,	495 "
	4.895 chs.			N. 10° E.,	136 "
N. 72° 36' W.	887.2 ft.,	"	" 94 plus 1;	N. 77° 30' E.,	590 "
	13.443 chs.			N. 37° 45' W.,	311 "
S. 82° 28' W.	956.1 ft.,	"	" 94 plus 2;	N. 9° E.,	482 "
	14.487 chs.				

N. 81° 07' W.	1060.5 ft.,	to Ref. Mon. No. 10,		N. 3° 45' E.,	414 "
	16.068 chs.				
N. 31° 58' W.	384.4 ft.,	to W. P. 109;		N. 15° W.,	16 "
	5.825 chs.				
S. 73° 02' W.	805.9 ft.,	"	" 101;	N. 15° W.,	12 "
	12.211 chs.				
S. 66° 04' W.	410.4 ft.,	"	" 102;	N. 29° W.,	8 "
	6.218 chs.				
S. 68° 44' E.	326.0 ft.,	"	" 102 plus 1;		
	4.940 chs.				
S. 48° 12' W.	615.5 ft.,	"	" 102 plus 2;	N. 9° 30' W.,	318 "
	9.326 chs.				
S. 40° 00' W.	594.1 ft.,	"	" 102 plus 3;	N. 89° W.,	237 "
	9.002 chs.				
S. 27° 35' W.	775.0 ft.,	"	" 102 plus 4;	S. 87° 45' W.,	303 "
	11.743 chs.				
S. 22° 03' W.	756.4 ft.,	"	" 102 plus 5;	N. 49° 15' W.,	256 "
	11.461 chs.				
S. 4° 02' W.	700.4 ft.,	"	" 102 plus 6;	N. 35° 15' W.,	573 "
	10.612 chs.				
S. 33° 40' W.	821.2 ft.,	"	" 102 plus 7;	N. 24° 30' W.,	582 "
	12.443 chs.				
N. 75° 59' W.	806.9 ft.,	"	" 109;	N. 30° W.,	57 "
	12.226 chs.				
S. 76° 22' W.	556.5 ft.,	"	" 110;	N. 45° W.,	6 "
	8.432 chs.				
S. 51° 24' W.	259.5 ft.,	"	" 111;	N. 45° W.,	5 "
	3.932 chs.				

TRAVERSE OF WITNESS POSTS AND CONNECTIONS—Continued

From W. P. 111, Reference Monument No. 9 bears S. 38° 51′ 10″ E., 3257.7 ft. (49.813 chs.) dist.; Reference Monument No. 11 bears S. 47° 59′ 20″ W., 5700.6 ft. (86.373 chs.) dist.; thence from W. P. 111

Bearing.	Distance.	Witness post.	Connections to the boundary.	
S. 20° 00′ W.	1019.7 ft., or 15.450 chs.	to W. P. 111 plus 1;	N. 26° 15′ W.,	564 ft.
N. 52° 05′ W.	476.1 ft., or 7.213 chs.	" " 114;	N. 45° W.,	9 "
S. 52° 10′ W.	327.8 ft., or 4.967 chs.	" " 115;	N. 37° W.,	8 "
S. 48° 01′ W.	172.0 ft., or 2.606 chs.	" " 116;	N. 45° W.,	14 "
S. 66° 11′ W.	322.4 ft., or 4.885 chs.	" " 117;	N. 45° W.,	3 "
S. 42° 41′ W.	146.7 ft., or 2.223 chs.	" " 118;	N. 45° W.,	5 "
S. 66° 02′ W.	325.6 ft., or 4.934 chs.	" " 119;		0 "
S. 50° 01′ W.	177.7 ft., or 2.693 chs.	" " 120;	N. 30° W.,	9 "
S. 74° 43′ W.	360.6 ft.,	" " 121;	North,	4 "

From W. P. 121, Reference Monument No. 11 bears S. 40° 50' 00" W., 2078.6 ft. (45.131 chs.) dist.; Witness Corner Sec. 5, T. 5 S., R. 14 W., on the Oklahoma bluff, bears N. 62° 18' 40" W., 7844.3 ft. (118.853 chs.) dist.; thence from W. P. 121

West	277.6 ft. (4.206 chs.)	to W. P. 122;	North,	8 ft.

From W. P. 122, W. P. "122 plus 1" bears S. 40° 51' W., 482.3 ft. (7.307 chs.) dist., thence from W. P. 122

S. 82° 24' W.	614.5 ft. (9.311 chs.)	to W. P. 123;	North,	10 ft.

From W. P. 123, W. P. "122 plus 1" bears S. 46° 01' E., 408.0 ft. (6.182 chs.) dist.; thence from W. P. 123;

N. 79° 53' W.	404.3 ft. (6.126 chs.)	to W. P. 124;	N. 10° E.,	6 ft.
S. 82° 10' W.	341.2 ft. (5.170 chs.)	" " 125;	N. 45° W.,	4 "
S. 59° 01' W.	240.5 ft. (3.644 chs.)	" " 126;	N. 30° W.,	23 "
S. 80° 45' W.	405.1 ft. (6.138 chs.)	" " 127;	N. 51° 30' E.,	110 "
			N. 33° 30' W.,	272 "
N. 67° 41' W.	409.5 ft. (6.205 chs.)	" " 128;	N. 20° W.,	9 "
S. 57° 44' W.	605.0 ft. (9.166 chs.)	" " 130;	N. 30° W.,	12 "

TRAVERSE OF WITNESS POSTS AND CONNECTIONS—Continued

From W. P. 130, Reference Monument No. 11 bears S. 32° 30′ 00″ E., 2181.6 ft. (33.055 chs.) dist.; Reference Monument No. 12 bears S. 40° 00′ 10″ W., 4352.3 ft. (65.944 chs.) dist.; thence from W. P. 130

Bearing.	Distance.	Witness post.	Connections to the boundary.	
S. 34° 05′ W.	594.7 ft., 9.010 chs.	to W. P. 130 plus 1;	N. 14° W.,	330 ft.
N. 73° 37′ W.	427.2 ft., 6.472 chs.	" " 134;	West,	11 "
S. 2° 43′ W.	428.7 ft., 6.495 chs.	" " 135;	West,	6 "
S. 16° 02′ W.	172.4 ft., 2.612 chs.	" " 136;	N. 75° W.,	21 "
S. 2° 15′ E.	181.2 ft., 2.746 chs.	" " 137;	West,	135 "
S. 7° 47′ W.	181.5 ft., 2.750 chs.	" " 138;	N. 75° W.,	214 "
S. 54° 46′ W.	608.0 ft., 9.212 chs.	" " 139;	N. 45° W.,	50 "

From W. P. 139, Reference Monument No. 11 bears S. 86° 17′ 10″ E., 2502.5 ft. (37.917 chs.) dist.; Reference

Monument No. 12 bears S. 41° 49' 40" W., 2216.2 ft. (33.579 chs.) dist.; thence from W. P. 139

S. 42° 27' W.	256.4 ft. (3.885 chs.)	to W. P. 140;	N. 40° W.,	103 ft.
S. 54° 40' W.	126.3 ft. (1.914 chs.)	" " 141;	N. 30° W.,	138 "

Witness Post No. 141 is coincident with the N. E. Cor of Texas Senior Survey No. 820, established in 1861: thence from W. P. 141

S. 64° 24' W.	110.7 ft. (1.677 chs.)	to W. P. 142;	N. 30° W.,	144 ft.
S. 81° 11' W.	146.2 ft. (2.215 chs.)	" " 143;	N. 20° W.,	124 "
S. 62° 37' W.	128.5 ft. (1.947 chs.)	" " 144;	N. 20° 06' W.,	122 "
S. 79° 07' W.	226.0 ft. (3.438 chs.)	" " 145;	N. 25° W.,	82 "
S. 72° 30' W.	77.0 ft. (1.167 chs.)	" " 146;	N. 22° 31' W.,	80 "
S. 64° 23' W.	123.7 ft. (1.950 chs.)	" " 147;	N. 30° W.,	88 "
S. 55° 21' W.	106.2 ft. (1.609 chs.)	" " 148;	North,	112 "
N. 69° 15' W.	196.7 ft. (2.980 chs.)	" " 149;	N. 20° W.,	1 "
S. 72° 27' W.	164.5 ft. (2.493 chs.)	" " 150;	N. 45° W.,	1 "
S. 50° 13' W.	155.7 ft. (2.359 chs.)	" " 151;		0 "
S. 83° 22' W.	150.3 ft. (2.277 chs.)	" " 152;	N. 40° W.,	23 "
S. 60° 56' W.	313.7 ft. (4.753 chs.)	" " 153;	S. 30° E.,	3 "

TRAVERSE OF WITNESS POSTS AND CONNECTIONS—Continued

From W. P. 153, Reference Monument No. 12 bears S. 32° 55′ 00″ E., 1022.2 ft. (15.488 chs.) dist.; Witness Corner Sec. 5, T. 5 S., R. 14 W., on the Oklahoma bluff, bears N. 4° 06′ 20″ W., 6546.1 ft. (99.183 chs.) dist.; thence from W. P. 153

Bearing.	Distance.	Witness post.	Connections to the boundary.	
S. 44° 34′ W.	444.2 ft., 6.730 chs.	to W. P. 154;	N. 45° W.,	44 ft.
S. 58° 52′ W.	183.4 ft., 2.770 chs.	" " 155;	N. 45° W.,	7 "
S. 60° 31′ W.	220.0 ft., 3.333 chs.	" " 156;	N. 45° W.,	7 "
S. 55° 51′ W.	220.9 ft., 3.347 chs.	" " 157;	N. 30° W.,	62 "
S. 84° 25′ W.	130.0 ft., 1.970 chs.	" " 158;	N. 10° W.,	4 "
S. 75° 49′ W.	114.4 ft., 1.733 chs.	" " 159;	N. 10° W.,	7 "
S. 68° 10′ W.	175.9 ft., 2.665 chs.	" " 160;	N. 30° W.,	7 "
S. 44° 39′ W.	261.6 ft., 3.964 chs.	" " 161;	N. 45° W.,	22 "
S. 59° 30′ W.	316.4 ft.,	" " 162;	N. 30° E.,	125 "

	4.794 chs.		N. 3° 50' E., 98 "
			N. 30° W., 75 "
			N. 80° W., 125 "
S. 70° 04' W.	324.8 ft.,	" " 163;	N. 30° E., 134 "
	4.921 chs.		N. 21° W., 95 "
			N. 54° W., 115 "
N. 85° 27' W.	313.9 ft.,	" " 164,	N 30° W., 3 "
	4.754 chs.		

From W. P. 164, Reference Monument No. 12 bears N. 84° 00' 20" E., 2903.1 ft. (43.986 chs.) dist.; Reference Monument No. 13 bears S. 42° 01' 00" W., 1387.5 ft. (21.022 chs.) dist.; thence from W. P. 164

S. 61° 46' W.	350.3 ft.,	to W. P. 165;	N. 45° W., 5 ft.
	5.307 chs.		
S. 52° 51' W.	252.8 ft.,	" " 166;	N. 45° W., 8 "
	3.830 chs.		
S. 60° 04' W.	371.0 ft.,	" " 167;	N. 38° W., 3 "
	5.621 chs.		
S. 44° 36' W.	292.5 ft.,	" " 168;	N. 48° W., 3 "
	4.432 chs.		
S. 40° 06' W.	376.2 ft.,	" " 169;	N. 45° W., 4 "
	5.700 chs.		

From W. P. 169, Reference Monument No. 13 bears S. 82° 21' 00" E., 362.4 ft. (5.491 chs.) dist., Witness Corner Sec. 5, T. 5 S., R. 14 W., on the Oklahoma bluff, bears N. 19° 57' 50" E., 9228.0 ft. (139.818 chs.) dist.; thence from W. P. 169

S. 47° 12' W.	712.1 ft.,	to W. P. 170;	N. 42° W., 3 ft.
	10.789 chs.		
S. 30° 52' W.	583.2 ft.,	" " 171;	N. 36° W., 8 "
	8.836 chs.		
S. 58° 12' W.	566.0 ft.,	" " 172;	N. 30° W., 4 "
	8.575 chs.		
S. 59° 01' W.	471.0 ft.,	" " 173;	N. 28° W., 4 "
	7.136 chs.		
S. 64° 50' W.	767.7 ft.,	" " 174;	N. 24° W., 4 "
	11.632 chs.		
S. 70° 05' W.	982.3 ft.,	" " 175;	N. 20° W., 4 "
	14.884 chs.		
S. 70° 27' W.	557.9 ft.,	" " 176;	N. 20° W., 4 "
	8.453 chs.		

TRAVERSE OF WITNESS POSTS AND CONNECTIONS—Continued

From W. P. 176, Reference Monument No. 13 bears N. 63° 19′ 30″ E., 4884.0 ft. (74.000 chs.) dist.; North Range Line Station 15/14, on the Oklahoma bluff, bears N. 20° 36′ 00″ W., 7690.8 ft. (116.527 chs.) dist.; thence from W. P. 176

Bearing.	Distance.	Witness post.	Connections to the boundary.	
S. 68° 10′ W.	1207.1 ft., 18.290 chs.	to W. P. 177;	N. 14° W.,	14 ft.
S. 85° 29′ W.	208.4 ft., 3.157 chs.	" " 178;	N. 10° W.,	11 "
S. 76° 30′ W.	324.6 ft., 4.918 chs.	" " 179;	N. 17° W.,	6 "
S. 70° 53′ W.	385.1 ft., 5.835 chs.	" " 180;	N. 25° W.,	5 "
S. 59° 11′ W.	183.9 ft., 2.786 chs.	" " 181;	N. 45° W.,	12 "
S. 31° 59′ W.	165.2 ft., 2.503 chs.	" " 182;	N. 45° W.,	8 "
S. 58° 02′ W.	531.6 ft., 8.054 chs.	" " 183;	North,	18 "

Southerly extension of the west line of Range 14 West in Oklahoma, 657.5 ft. (9.962 chs.) to Reference

10`

Oil Wells Within 300 Ft. of Boundary.

Oil Wells in Texas.

F. R. No 101.

From W. P. 100, F. R. 101 bears N. 70° 00′ E., 172 ft. dist. This well is in Texas. The nearest point on the boundary bears N. 17° W., 7 ft. dist.

F. R No 132.

From W. P. 114, F. R. 132 bears S. 13° 47′ E., 247.8 ft. dist. This well is in Texas. The nearest point on the boundary bears N. 38° W., 233 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 134.

From W. P. 115, F. R. 134 bears S. 37° 09′ E., 7.8 ft. dist. This well is in Texas. The nearest point on the boundary bears N. 37° W., 15.8 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 135.

From W. P. 116, F. R. 135 bears S. 45° 39′ W., 180.4 ft. dist. This well is in Texas. The nearest point on the boundary bears N. 26° W., 70 ft. dist.

F. R No. 136.

From W. P. 118, F. R. 136 bears S. 59° 37′ E., 215.3 ft. dist. This well is in Texas. The nearest point on the boundary bears N. 47° W., 220 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 137.

From W. P. 118, F. R. 137 bears S. 41° 07′ W., 237 ft. dist. This well is in Texas. The nearest point on the boundary bears N. 24° W., 104 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 138.

From W. P. 125, F. R. 138 bears S. 46° 22′ E., 339 ft. dist. This well is in Texas. The nearest point on the boundary bears N. 8° W., 270 ft. dist.

Well Location.

From W. P. 128, an unidentified well casing bears N. 70° 45′ E., 122 ft. dist. This well is in Texas. The nearest point on the boundary bears N. 17° W., 5 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 145.

From W. P. 138, F. R. 145 bears S. 32° 58′ E., 87 ft. dist. This well is in Texas. The nearest point on the boundary bears N. 52° W., 281 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 146.

From W. P. 138, F. R. 146 bears S. 43° 06′ W., 183 ft. dist. This well is in Texas. The nearest point on the boundary bears N. 50° W., 186 ft. dist.

South, on an extension of the west line of Range 14 West, in Oklahoma, 3075 ft. (3.05 Monument No. 14.

F. R. No. 147.

From W. P. 139, F. R. 147 bears N. 61° 13' E. This well is in Texas. The nearest point on the N. 50° W., 148 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 148.

From W. P. 139, F. R. 148 bears N. 69° 16' E. This well is in Texas. The nearest point on the N. 50° W., 88 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 152.

From W. P. 144, F. R. 152 bears N. 20° 05' W. This well is in Texas. The nearest point on the N. 20° 05' W., 20 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 153

From W. P. 146, F. R. 153 bears N. 22° 31' W. This well is in Texas. The nearest point on the N. 23° W., 49 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 154

From W. P. 148, F. R. 154 bears S. 43° 14' W. This well is in Texas. The nearest point on the N. 12° W., 143 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 157.

From W. P. 150, F. R. 157 bears S. 23° 34' E. This well is in Texas. The nearest point on the N. 18° W., 180 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 159.

From W. P. 152, F. R. 159 bears S. 23° 50' E. This well is in Texas. The nearest point on the North, 167 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 160.

From W. P. 152, F. R. 160 bears S. 76° 51' E. This well is in Texas. The nearest point on the N. 20° W., 8 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 162.

From W. P. 153, F. R. 162 bears S. 37° 29' E. This well is in Texas. A point on the boundary bears 145 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 165.

From W. P. 155, F. R. 165 bears N. 28° 33' E. This well is in Texas. The nearest point on the N. 45° W., 5 ft. dist.

Woodburn Oil Corporation' No.

From W. P. 155, Woodburn Oil Corporation' S. 44° 58' E., 248.6 ft. dist. This well is in Te point on the boundary bears N. 34° W., 251 ft. dis

Woodburn Oil Corporation' No. 1.

From W. P. 156, Woodburn Oil Corporation' Well No. 1 bears S. 25° 25' E., 274.8 ft. dist. This well is in Texas. The nearest point on the boundary bears N. 23° 30' W., 281 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 169.

From W. P. 158, F. R. 169 bears N. 58° 40' E., 79.9 ft. dist. This well is in Texas. A point on the boundary bears North, 12 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 170.

From W. P. 159, F. R. 170 bears S. 33° 25' W., 74.1 ft dist. This well is in Texas. The nearest point on the boundary bears N. 24° W., 46 ft dist.

Petroleum Development Co.' No. 4.

From W. P. 159, Petroleum Development Co.' Well No. 4 bears South, 266.9 ft. dist. This well is in Texas. The nearest point on the boundary bears N. 24° W., 250 ft. dist.

Petroleum Development Co.' No. 1.

From W. P. 161, Petroleum Development Co.' Well No. 1 bears S. 16° 14' E., 163.1 ft. dist. This well is in Texas. The nearest point on the boundary bears N. 23° W., 185 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 172.

From W. P. 161, F. R. 172 bears N. 20° 18' E., 53.4 ft. dist. This well is in Texas. The nearest point on the boundary bears N. 45° W., 15 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 186.

From W. P. 162, F. R. 186 bears N. 3° 30' E., 85.8 ft. dist. This well is in Texas. The nearest point on the boundary bears N. 3° 30' E., 12 ft. dist.

Well Location.

From W. P. 163, an unidentified oil well bears S. 67° 03' E., 273.4 ft. dist. This well is in Texas. The nearest point on the boundary bears N. 16° 30' W., 248 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 174.

From W. P. 163, F. R. 174 bears N. 12° 55' E., 71.5 ft. dist. This well is in Texas. The nearest point on the boundary bears N. 15° W., 30 ft. dist.

Well Location.

From W. P. 164, an unidentified oil well bears S. 39° 57' E., 251.9 ft. dist. This well is in Texas. The nearest point on the boundary bears N. 10° W., 247 ft. dist.

F. R. No.

From W. P. 164, F. R. 176 bear
This well is in Texas. The near
N. 10° W., 95 ft. dist.

Foster & Wats

From W. P. 165, Foster & Watson'
218.4 ft. dist. This well is in Tex
boundary bears N. 25° W., 205 ft. d

F. R. No.

From W. P. 165, F. R. 178 bear
This well is in Texas. The nearest
N. 25° W., 51 ft. dist.

F. R. No.

From W. P. 166, F. R. 180 bear
This well is in Texas. A point on t
23.3 ft. dist.

Hobbs Oil Co.' Green-

From W. P. 166, Hobbs Oil Co.
bears S. 21° 30′ E., 151.1 ft. dist.
nearest point on the boundary bears

Hobbs Oil Co.' Green-

From W. P. 168, Hobbs Oil Co.
bears N. 64° 43′ E., 182.4 ft. dist.
nearest point on the boundary bears

Hobbs Oil Co.' Green-

From W. P. 168, Hobbs Oil Co.
bears S. 31° 20′ W., 199.6 ft. dist.
nearest point on the boundary bears

Oil Wells in Ok

O. C. Graves

From W. P. 102, O. C. Graves Oil
219 ft. dist. This well is in Oklah
boundary bears S. 46° E., 35 ft. dist

F. R. No.

From W. P. 109, F. R. 130 bea
This well is in Oklahoma. The nea
S. 16° E., 199 ft. dist.

Well Loc

From W. P. 110, an unidentified
106.6 ft. dist. This well is in Oklah
boundary bears S. 19° E., 20 ft. dis

F. R. No. 133.

From W. P. 114, F. R. 133 bears N. 4° 00′ W., 24 ft. dist. This well is in Oklahoma. The nearest point on the boundary bears S. 50° E., 6 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 139.

From W. P. 125, F. R. 139 bears N. 64° 55′ E., 50.7 ft. dist. This well is in Oklahoma. The nearest point on the boundary bears S. 8° E., 9 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 149.

From W. P. 139, F. R. 149 bears N. 21° 51′ W., 248 ft. dist. This well is in Oklahoma. The nearest point on the boundary bears S. 50° E., 175 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 150.

From W. P. 140, F. R. 150 bears N. 32° 15′ W., 385 ft. dist. This well is in Oklahoma. The nearest point on the boundary bears S. 17° E., 276 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 151.

From W. P. 144, F. R. 151 bears N. 1° 27′ E., 360 ft. dist. This well is in Oklahoma. The nearest point on the boundary bears S. 19° E., 195 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 155.

From W. P. 150, F. R. 155 bears N. 30° 56′ E., 185.8 ft. dist. This well is in Oklahoma. The nearest point on the boundary bears S. 15° E., 122 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 158.

From W. P. 150, F. R. 158 bears N. 39° 43′ W., 302.5 ft. dist. This well is in Oklahoma. The nearest point on the boundary bears S. 39° 43′ E., 301.5 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 164.

From W. P. 154, F. R. 164 bears N. 27° 40′ E., 270.5 ft. dist. This well is in Oklahoma. A point on the boundary bears South, 94 ft. dist. The nearest point on the boundary bears S. 41° 30′ E., 70 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 218.

From W. P. 155, F. R. 218 bears N. 3° 47′ W., 290.6 ft. dist. This well is in Oklahoma. The nearest point on the boundary bears S. 42° E., 219 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 219.

From W. P. 156, F. R. 219 bears N. 19° 26′ W., 262.6 ft. dist. This well is in Oklahoma. The nearest point on the boundary bears S. 23° 30′ E., 256 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 167.

From W. P. 157, F. R. 167 bears N. 46° 45′ E., 167.9 ft. dist. This well is in Oklahoma. The nearest point on the boundary bears S. 45° E., 6 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 220.

From W. P. 157, F. R. 220 bears N. 38° 3
This well is in Oklahoma. A point on the boun
E., 212 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 170.

From W. P. 165, F. R. 170 bears N. 25° 1
This well is in Oklahoma. The nearest point o
S. 25° E., 247 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 214.

From W. P. 166, F. R. 214 bears N. 9° 2
This well is in Oklahoma. The nearest point o
S. 25° E., 262 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 182.

From W. P. 160, F. R. 182 bears N. 12° C
This well is in Oklahoma. The nearest point o
S. 40° E., 126 ft. dist.



Bronze Tablet imbedded in each Refe

Description of Reference Monuments.

The reference monuments on the Texas side are made of concrete, moulded in mass at the station, in galvanized iron forms 36 ins. long, 18 ins. upper diameter, 24 ins. base diameter, set 30 ins. in the ground. The center of each monument is marked by a heavy bronze tablet, inscribed as shown on facing page.

The monuments on the Oklahoma bluff are correlated with the United States General Land Office public-land subdivisional survey. Each one is an iron post, 30 ins. long, 2 ins. diameter, having a bronze cap, the post being placed full length in concrete, in a galvanized iron form 36 ins. long, 8 ins. upper diameter, 14 ins. diameter at the base, set 30 ins. in the ground. These monuments are appropriately marked according to the standard specifications of the General Land Office. They readily identify the position of the monument in the United States rectangular survey system. In each case the neighboring public-land survey corner, to which connections are shown in the following field notes and on the maps, are similarly constructed as a further amplification of the control system, this work having been performed by an engineer detailed by the General Land Office, the field notes of whose operations are, or within convenient time will be, filed with the records of that office.

The early Texas survey lines in this vicinity are shown on the maps in accordance with the best available information regarding their true position.

Reference Monuments in Texas.

Reference Monument No. 1.

This station is on the meridional extension of the line between Ranges 12 and 13 West, in Oklahoma. The monument is located on a gentle north slope 270 ft. south of the top of the steep timbered portion of the Texas bluff, and at a point 870 ft. southeast of a small farm house. The station is in the John Deck Survey No. 277. The point is about 4 miles east and 2 mile south of Burkburnett from which place the station may be conveniently reached by wagon road. The point is designated "South Range line Station 13/12" (S. Rg. L. 13/12).

Reference Monument No 2.

This station is on a prominent knoll overlooking the river valley, in the John Deck Survey No. 275. The point is about 3 miles east and ½ mile south of Burkburnett. The point may be conveniently reached from The Texas Company's Pump Station, which is located at the nearest point on the public road, from which the highest point on the Texas bluff may be recognized to the north-

west a little over a mile distant. The monument
point of the knoll about 100 ft. south of the edge
ing on the steep slope of the bluff. The point
man Station."

From this station Wilks Station, U. S. C. & G.
bears S. 88° 02' 37" E., 9686 ft.; Cashion Station
in Texas, bears S. 4° 26' 25" E., 25849 ft.

Reference Monument No. 3.

This station is on the Texas bluff, just north
and 40 ft. south of the steep slope. The
east of the south end of Burkburnett Toll
north of a farm house. The station is in the
vey No. 816. The point is about 2 miles east
which place the station may be conveniently
road. The point is designated "Burke Bridge

Reference Monument No. 4

This station is on the Texas bluff, 60 ft. south
slope, and at a point 650 ft. east of the Fowler
also a large red barn and a galvanized iron silo
ment and the farm house. The station is in the
vey No. 816; it is about 1 mile north and a
Burkburnett, from which place the station
reached by wagon road. The point is designated

From this station Gammill Station, U. S. C. &
bears N. 39° 19' 25" E., 29486 ft.; Wilks Station
in Oklahoma, bears S. 65° 36' 09" E., 29675 ft.

Reference Monument No.

This station is on high ground in the vicinity
provements; there is fair weather access to the north
cated a short distance west of the Missouri, Kansas
road, on the top of a gentle ridge, 1000 ft. south
Texas bluff.

From this station, the water tower at Dundee
N. 0° 55' W.; the water tower at Burkburnett
03' E., a little less than 2 miles distant. The
"Railroad Station."

Reference Monument No.

This station is in the river valley, in a grove
about 700 ft. southwest of the south bank of the
a mile northeast of the Texas bluff. This is

Reference Monument No. 7.

This station is on the meridional extension of the line between Ranges 13 and 14 West, in Oklahoma. The monument is located on a gentle north slope about [illegible] ft. south of the top of the Texas bluff. The station is in the William Rivers Survey No. 810. The station is about 2 miles west and 3 miles north of Burkburnett; it is near the Sinclair Pump Station

From this station the water tower at Burkburnett, Texas, bears S. 38° 13' E., the water tower at Grandfield, Oklahoma, bears N. 35° 22' W. The point is designated "South Range Line Station 14 13" (S. Rg. L. 14 13)

From this station Grandfield Station, U. S. C. & G. S., in Oklahoma, bears N. 31° 42' 10" W., 37035 ft., Gammill Station, U. S. C. & G. S., in Oklahoma, bears N. 79° 31' 50" E., 30503 ft.

Reference Monument No. 8.

This station is on a prominent position on the Texas bluff, at the top of the ascent west of Wild Horse Creek and about 300 ft. south of the river bluff. The station is in the Elizabeth Stanley Survey No. 812. It is in the central part of the northwest extension of the Burkburnett Oil Field, about 3 miles west and 3 miles north of the town of Burkburnett, and may be reached by several different roads. The point is designated "Texas Chief Station."

Reference Monument No. 9

This station is 150 ft. south of the top of the Texas bluff. It is in the Elizabeth Stanley Survey No. 812, and is in the central part of the oil field. The station is located about 4 miles west and 3 miles north of Burkburnett, and may be reached by an irregular road among the oil wells in this vicinity. The power house of the Center Gulf Production Company is about [illegible] ft. south of the monument. The point is designated "Two Tanks Station."

From this station the water tower at Grandfield, Oklahoma, bears N. 22° 05' W., and the water tower at Devol, Oklahoma, bears N. 43° 06' E.

Reference Monument No. 10

This station is in the river valley in the extreme north point of the "Big Bend," about 1¼ miles north of the foot of the Texas bluff and about 400 ft. south of the south bank of Red River. This is an auxiliary monument.

Reference Monument No. 11.

This station is on a high point on the Texas bluff, slightly east of an extension of the center line of Grandfield Wagon Bridge. It is in the F. W. Huesman Survey No. 812, about 1000 ft. northeast of the oil field settlement known as "Bridgetown." The point is designated "Bridgetown Station."

28

Reference Monumen

This station is on a prominent poin
half a mile west of Bridgetown. The
power line which serves the oil field wit
tion is in the Hrs. of L. Powell Sur
corner of which is coincident with Witn
is designated "Power Line Station."

From this station Tipton Station o
Oklahoma, bears N. 75° 07' 17" W., 2
U. S. C. & G. S., also in Oklahoma, bear

Reference Monumen

This station is on the crest of a sharp
highest points of the Texas Bluff. It
and Land Company Survey No. 821.
west of the Bonner Refinery, and ma
from Bridgetown. The point is design

Reference Monume

This station is on the meridional c
Ranges 14 and 15 West, in Oklahom
south of the south bank of Red River.
to the north. This station is in a dire
ment No. 13 to Reference Monument
the first one in Area "B." The statio
No. 825. The station is on the farm
is a considerable distance from any p
be reached from Bridgetown from wh
2½ miles west and 1 mile south. Th
the slope west of the farm house. T
Range Line Station 15/14" (S. Rg. L

Reference Monuments

North Range Li

This station is at the top of the Oklah
Township 5 South, between Ranges 1
ft. south of the Cor. of Secs. 1, 6, 7 a
south and 2 miles west of Grandfi
public road from Grandfield

From this station Grandfield Station
bears N. 29° 42' 30" E., 29587 ft : N
also in Oklahoma, bears N. 82° 16' 23

Witness Corne

This station is on the top of a k
a point from which the Cor. of Sec

between Townships 4 and 5 South, Range 14 West, bears N. 22° 51′ E., 1682.5 ft. The point is about 300 ft. west of the north end of Grandfield Wagon Bridge. The section corner referred to is located at the intersection of public roads, N. & S., and E. & W., 4 miles due south of Grandfield.

¼ Sec. Cor. 34/35.

This station is the ¼ Sec. Cor. between Secs. 34 and 35, Township 4 South, Range 14 West, in Oklahoma; it is on nearly level ground just south of the top of steep bluff. The point may be reached by road from Grandfield, from which the station is 3½ miles south and 2 miles east.

From this station Miller Station, of the U. S. C. & G. S., in Oklahoma, bears S. 84° 30′ 52″ E., 21617 ft.

North Range Line 14/13.

This station is the ¼ Sec. Cor. between Secs. 31 and 36, on the line through Township 4 South, between Ranges 13 and 14 West, in Oklahoma. The station is on nearly level ground about 1000 ft. north of the north bank of Red River. The bank is erroding. The station may be reached by road from Grandfield, from which the station is 3½ miles south and 4 miles east. Devol, Oklahoma, is 1½ miles north and 1 mile east.

Miller Station.

This is a triangulation station of the U. S. Coast and Geodetic Survey, and is monumented according to the standard specifications of that survey. The station is on a high ridge. From the station Cor. of Secs. 4, 5, 32 and 33, on the line between Townships 4 and 5 South, Range 13 West, bears S. 36° 23′ W., 669.8 ft. The section corner referred to is located at the intersection of public roads, N. & S., and E. & W., 1 mile east, and 2 miles south of Devol.

Witness Point Sec. 14.

This station is on the Oklahoma bluff, on the north and south center line of Sec. 14, Township 5 South, Range 13 West. The station is a short distance west of the main road leading to Burk-Burnett Wagon Bridge; it is 3½ miles east and 4 miles south of Devol.

From this station Gammill Station, U. S. C. & G. S., in Oklahoma, bears N. 7° 53′ 03″ E., 12433 ft.; Willis Station, U. S. C. & G. S., also in Oklahoma, bears S. 40° 43′ 01″ E., 17054 ft. The ¼ Sec. Cor. between Secs. 11 and 14, bears N. 0° 07′ W., 1150.7 ft. dist.

North Range Line 13/12.

This station is on the southwest slope of the Oklahoma bluff, on the line through Township 5 South, between Ranges 12 and 13 West, 5751 ft. south of the Cor. of Secs. 19, 24, 25 and 30. The

30

station is 5 miles east and 6 miles south of Dev
by public road from Devol.

From this station Cashion Station, of the U.
bears S. 8° 22′ 21″ W., 25080 ft. ; Miller Sta
in Oklahoma, bears N. 42° 53′ 26″ W., 30410

Description of Witness Po

The witness posts are all rough pine, creos
are 5 ft. 6 ins. long, and about 4 ins. in diam
ground. The initial and terminal witness p
nearest the Burkburnett and Grandfield T
one set on the extension of the line between M
are 8 inches in diameter, set 42 inches in
of each post above ground is squared, and p

The posts are numbered up-stream. The n
the lower limit of Area "A"; the terminal
the upper limit of the area. Some of the wi
numbers (for example No. 34 plus 3). These
set to take the place of other posts carried a
the survey was being made. The numbers
of the posts; they are also stenciled on the sid

Tex.—Okla. Bdy. (on side towards the rive

Witness Post (on side downstream);

U. S. Supreme Court (on side upstream);

Number (on side opposite to the river).

TABLE 1. AZIMUTHS AND LENGTHS OF LINES CONNECTING REFERENCE MONUMENTS AND WITNESS POSTS.

Station.	Forward and back azimuth.	To station.	Distance
R. M. No. 1	North	N. Rg. L. 13/12	10503.8 Ft.
	South		159.149 Chs.
	North	W. P. No. "O"	2138.2 Ft.
	South		32.397 Chs.
	N. 37° 57′ 40″ W.	R. M. No. 2	10021.1 Ft.
	S. 37 58 20 E.		151.835 Chs.
R. M. No. 2	N. 67 05 50 E.	N. Rg. L. 13/12	6691.5 Ft.
	S. 67 06 30 W.		101.386 Chs.
	N. 14 26 00 E.	W. P. No. 10	340.2 Ft.
	S. 14 26 00 W.		5.155 Chs.
	N. 7 52 40 W.	W. P. Sec. 14	12726.4 Ft.
	S. 7 52 50 E.		192.825 Chs.
	N. 51 32 10 W.	R. M. No. 3	5137.2 Ft.
	S. 51 32 30 E.		77.836 Chs.
R. M. No. 3	S. 86 41 10 E.	N. Rg. L. 13/12	10203.2 Ft.
	N. 86 40 00 W.		154.594 Chs.
	N. 52 55 00 E.	W. P. No. 17	166.9 Ft.
	S. 52 55 00 W.		2.529 Chs.
	N. 13 36 00 E.	W. P. Sec. 14	9682.1 Ft.
	S. 13 36 20 W.		146.699 Chs.
	N. 55 27 40 W.	R. M. No. 4	10168.6 Ft.
	S. 55 28 30 E.		154.070 Chs.

TABLE 1. AZIMUTHS AND LENGTHS OF LINES—Continued

Station.	Forward and back azimuth.	To station.	Distance.
R. M. No. 4	N. 83° 00′ 50″ E. S. 83 00 50 W.	W. P. No. 36	4308.1 Ft. 65.274 Chs.
	N. 71 05 40 E. S. 71 06 50 W.	W. P. Sec. 14	11259.5 Ft. 170.599 Chs.
	N. 7 41 00 W. S. 7 41 10 E.	Miller (C. & G. S.)	16059.3 Ft. 243.323 Chs.
	N. 20 00 10 W. S. 20 00 30 E.	R. M. No. 6	7371.2 Ft. 111.685 Chs.
	N. 63 39 10 W. S. 63 39 50 E.	R. M. No. 5	7343.6 Ft. 111.266 Chs.
		R. M. No. 6	5471.2 Ft. 82.897 Chs.
R. M. No. 5	N. 47 53 20 E. S. 47 53 50 W.	Miller (C. & G. S.)	13410.3 Ft.

	N.	19	17	40	E.		203.187 Chs.
	S.	19	18	10	W.		
	N.	17	15	00	W.	W. P. No. 69	7908.8 Ft
	S.	17	15	20	E.		119.899 Chs
	N.	57	26	40	W.	R. M. No. 7	7717.3 Ft.
	S.	57	27	30	E.		116.928 Chs
	N.	70	56	00	E.	W. P. No. 55	719.8 Ft
R. M No. 6	S.	70	56	00	W.		10.906 Chs

R. M. No. 7	N.	52	07	00	E.	Miller (C. & G. S.)	13853.2 Ft.
	S.	52	08	10	W		209.897 Chs.
	N.	50	42	50	E.	W. P. No. 69	5372.3 Ft.
	S.	50	43	20	W.		81.398 Chs
	North					N. Rg. L. 14/13	10571.1 Ft
	South						160.169 Chs
	North					W. P. No. 81	4460.4 Ft
	South						60.674 Chs
	N.	28	30	30	W	W. P. No. 85	5529.3 Ft
	S.	28	30	30	E.		83.777 Chs
	N.	45	00	40	W	¼ Sec. Cor. 34/35	14864.9 Ft
	S.	45	01	50	E.		225.741 Chs
	N.	75	15	40	W	R. M. No. 8	4926.5 Ft
	S.	75	16	10	E.		74.642 Chs
R. M. No. 8	N.	30	30	00	E.	W. P. No. 85	4185.1 Ft
	S.	30	30	00	W.		63.411 Chs
	N.	27	04	20	E.	N. Rg. L. 14/13	10465.1 Ft
	S.	27	04	50	W.		158.562 Chs.
	N.	23	53	20	W.	R. M. No. 10	7747.6 Ft
	S.	23	53	40	E.		117.388 Chs
	N.	31	58	30	W	¼ Sec. Cor. 34/35	10993.3 Ft
	S.	31	59	10	E		166.565 Chs.
	N.	84	05	30	W	R. M. No. 9	5684.2 Ft
	S.	84	06	00	E		86.125 Chs

5—15, ons.

TABLE 1. AZIMUTHS AND LENGTHS OF LINES—Continued

Station.	Forward and back azimuth.	To station.	Distance.
R. M. No. 9	N. 21° 09′ 40″ E. S. 21 09 50 W.	R. M. No. 10	6968.1 Ft. 105.577 Chs.
	N. 1 06 20 W. S. 1 06 20 E.	¼ Sec. Cor. 34/35	8741.7 Ft. 132.450 Chs.
	N. 38 51 00 W. S. 38 51 10 E.	W. P. No. 111	3287.7 Ft. 49.813 Chs.
	N. 67 38 50 W. S. 67 40 10 E.	W. C. Sec. 5	12213.1 Ft. 185.047 Chs.
	S. 78 44 00 W. N. 78 43 20 E.	R. M. No. 11	6421.8 Ft. 97.360 Chs.
R. M. No. 10	N. 34 58 00 W. S. 34 58 00 E.	W. P. No. 100	384.4 Ft. 5.825 Chs.
		¼ Sec. Cor. 34/35	3496.7 Ft.

		N.	50	08	20	W.	
		S.	50	08	40	E.	
R. M. No. 11		N.	47	58	50	E.	
		S.	47	59	20	W.	
		N.	31	30	30	E.	
		S.	31	31	10	W.	
		N.	40	50	00	E.	
		S.	40	50	00	W.	
						W. P. No. 111	5700.6 Ft. 86.373 Chs.
						¼ Sec. Cor. 34/35	11724.5 Ft. 177.644 Chs.
						W. P. No. 121	2078.6 Ft. 45.131 Chs.

R. M. No. 11		N.	32	30	00	W.	
		S.	32	30	00	E.	
		N.	40	16	50	W.	
		S.	40	17	20	E.	
		N.	86	17	10	W.	
		S.	86	17	10	E.	
		S.	69	28	10	W.	
		N.	69	27	50	E.	
R. M. No. 12		N.	41	49	40	E.	
		S.	41	49	40	W.	
		N.	40	05	50	E.	
		S.	40	06	10	W.	
		N.	7	53	20	W.	
		S.	7	53	30	E.	
		N.	32	55	00	W.	
		S.	32	55	00	E.	
		N.	71	21	00	W.	
		S.	71	22	10	E.	
		S.	84	00	20	W.	
		N.	84	00	20	E.	
		S.	70	43	50	W.	
		N.	70	43	30	E.	
						W. P. No. 130	2181.6 Ft. 33.055 Chs.
						W. C. Sec. 5	7731.4 Ft. 117.142 Chs.
						W. P. No. 139	2502.5 Ft. 37.917 Chs.
						R. M. No. 12	4245.3 Ft. 64.323 Chs.
						W. P. No 139	2216.2 Ft. 33.579 Chs.
						W. P. No. 130	4352.3 Ft. 65.944 Chs.
						W. C. Sec. 5	7457.7 Ft. 112.995 Chs.
						W. P. No. 153	1022.2 Ft. 15.488 Chs.
						N. Rg. L. 15/14	11489.0 Ft. 174.076 Chs.
						W. P. No. 164	2903.1 Ft. 43.986 Chs.
						R. M. No. 13	4042.5 Ft. 61.250 Chs.

TABLE 1. AZIMUTHS AND LENGTHS OF LINES—Continued

Station.	Forward and back azimuth.	To station.	Distance
R. M. No. 13	N. 42° 01′ 00″ E. S. 42 01 00 W.	W. P. No. 164	1387.5 Ft. 21.022 Chs
	N. 17 44 50 E. S. 17 45 10 W.	W. C. Sec. 5	9457.4 Ft. 138.749 Chs
	N. 54 41 30 W. S. 54 42 20 E.	N. Rg. L. 15/14	8663.6 Ft. 131.266 Chs
	N. 82 21 00 W. S. 82 21 00 E.	W. P. No. 169	362.4 Ft. 5.491 Chs
	S. 60 19 40 W. N. 60 19 00 E.	R. M. No. 14	8138.5 Ft. 123.311 Chs
	S. 63 20 00 W. N. 63 19 30 E.	W. P. No. 176	4884.0 Ft. 74.000 Chs
R. M. No. 14	North South	W. P. No. 183	657.5 Ft 9.962 Chs.
	North South	N. Rg. L. 15/14	9086.3 Ft 136.914 Chs
		Cor. Secs. 1, 6, 7 & 12	30.0 Ft.

						0.451	Chs
N. Rg. L. 15/14.	North				A. P. No. 252	2422.0	Ft.
	South					36.698	Chs
	South				W. P. No. 176	7690.8	Ft.
	North					116.527	Chs
	S.	29°	36'	20"	W. C. Sec. 5	10537.6	Ft.
	N.	20	36	00	W.	159.661	Chs
	N.	69	20	50	E.		
	S.	69	21	50	W.		

W. C. Sec. 5	S.	19	58	10	W.	W. P. No. 160	9228.0 Ft.
	N.	19	57	50	E.		139.818 Chs.
	S.	4	06	20	E.	W. P. No. 153	6546.1 Ft.
	N.	4	06	20	W.		99.183 Chs.
	S.	62	19	30	E.	W. P. No. 121	7844.3 Ft.
	N.	62	18	40	W.		118.853 Chs.
	N.	69	46	20	E.	¼ Sec. Cor. 34/35	11856.4 Ft.
	S.	69	47	40	W.		179.643 Chs
	N.	22	51	00	E.	Cor. Secs. 4, 5, 32 & 33	1632.5 Ft.
	S.	22	51	00	W.		24.735 Chs.
¼ Sec. Cor. 34/35	S.	89	58	10	E.	N. Rg. L. 14/13	10584.6 Ft.
	N.	89	57	10	W.		160.373 Chs.
N. Rg. L. 14/13	S.	79	18	30	E.	Miller (C. & G. S.)	11126.3 Ft.
	N.	79	17	10	W.		168.580 Chs
Miller	S.	36	23	00	W.	Cor. Secs. 4, 5, 32 & 33	669.8 Ft.
(U. S. C. & G. S.)	N.	36	23	00	E.		10.148 Chs.
	S.	46	13	10	E.	W. P. Sec. 14	17729.2 Ft.
	N.	46	11	50	W.		268.624 Chs.
W. P. Sec. 14	N.	0	07	00	W.	¼ Sec. Cor. 11/14	1150.7 Ft.
	S.	0	07	00	E.		17.435 Chs.
	S.	38	20	10	E.	N. Rg. L. 13/12	12750.7 Ft.
	N.	38	19	20	W.		193.193 Chs.
N. Rg. L. 13/12	North					Cor. Secs. 19, 24, 25 & 30	575.1 Ft.
	South						8.714 Chs
	South					North Bank of Red River	1542.2 Ft.
	North						23.367 Chs.

TABLE 2. GEOGRAPHIC POSITIONS AND ELEVATIONS.

(a)

Reference Monuments on Texas Bluff.

Reference monument.	Latitude.	Longitude.	Distance (feet).	Elevation (feet).
R. M. No. 1	34° 04′ 13.730″	98° 30′ 18.830″	10021.1	993.546
R. M. No. 2	34 05 31.88	98 31 32.13	5137.2	1029.581
R. M. No. 3	34 06 03.496	98 32 19.961	50408.6	1023.130
R. M. No. 4	34 07 00.52	98 33 50.58	7343.6	1034.504
R. M. No. 5	34 07 32.756	98 35 17.858	5471.2	1039.388
R. M. No. 6	34 08 09.047	98 34 29.565	10575.5	999.092
R. M. No. 7	34 08 13.83	98 36 35.24	4926.5	1046.350
R. M. No. 8	34 08 26.227	98 37 31.929	5684.2	1070.613
R. M. No. 9	34 08 32.015	98 38 39.191	6968.1	1069.882
R. M. No. 10	34 09 35.295	98 38 09.282	11736.6	926.268
R. M. No. 11	34 08 19.598	98 39 54.115	4245.3	1115.417
R. M. No. 12	34 08 04.87	98 40 41.41	4042.5	1131.986
R. M. No. 13	34 07 51.057	98 41 26.811	8198.5	1114.246
R. M. No. 14	34 07 11.808	98 42 50.911		1052.780

(b)

Reference Monuments on Oklahoma Bluff.

Willis, U. S. C. & G. S.	34° 07′ 28.6697″	98° 30′ 49.1054″	4917.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 1	34 07 32.0	98 30 36.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 2	34 07 32.0	98 30 34.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 3	34 07 32.0	98 30 33.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 4	34 07 32.0	98 30 31.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 5	34 07 32.0	98 30 30.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 6	34 07 32.0	98 30 28.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 7	34 07 32.0	98 30 27.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 8	34 07 32.0	98 30 25.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 9	34 07 32.0	98 30 24.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 10	34 07 32.0	98 30 22.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 11	34 07 32.0	98 30 21.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 12	34 07 32.0	98 30 19.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 13	34 07 32.0	98 30 18.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 14	34 07 32.0	98 30 16.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 15	34 07 32.0	98 30 15.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 16	34 07 32.0	98 30 13.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 17	34 07 32.0	98 30 12.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 18	34 07 32.0	98 30 10.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 19	34 07 32.0	98 30 09.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 20	34 07 32.0	98 30 07.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 21	34 07 32.0	98 30 06.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 22	34 07 32.0	98 30 04.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 23	34 07 32.0	98 30 03.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 24	34 07 32.0	98 30 01.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 25	34 07 32.0	98 30 00.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 26	34 07 32.0	98 29 58.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 27	34 07 32.0	98 29 57.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 28	34 07 32.0	98 29 55.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 29	34 07 32.0	98 29 54.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 30	34 07 32.0	98 29 52.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 31	34 07 32.0	98 29 51.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 32	34 07 32.0	98 29 49.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 33	34 07 32.0	98 29 48.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 34	34 07 32.0	98 29 46.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 35	34 07 32.0	98 29 45.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 36	34 07 32.0	98 29 43.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 37	34 07 32.0	98 29 42.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 38	34 07 32.0	98 29 40.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 39	34 07 32.0	98 29 39.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 40	34 07 32.0	98 29 37.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 41	34 07 32.0	98 29 36.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 42	34 07 32.0	98 29 34.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 43	34 07 32.0	98 29 33.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 44	34 07 32.0	98 29 31.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 45	34 07 32.0	98 29 30.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 46	34 07 32.0	98 29 28.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 47	34 07 32.0	98 29 27.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 48	34 07 32.0	98 29 25.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 49	34 07 32.0	98 29 24.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 50	34 07 32.0	98 29 22.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 51	34 07 32.0	98 29 21.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 52	34 07 32.0	98 29 19.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 53	34 07 32.0	98 29 18.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 54	34 07 32.0	98 29 16.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 55	34 07 32.0	98 29 15.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 56	34 07 32.0	98 29 13.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 57	34 07 32.0	98 29 12.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 58	34 07 32.0	98 29 10.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 59	34 07 32.0	98 29 09.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 60	34 07 32.0	98 29 07.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 61	34 07 32.0	98 29 06.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 62	34 07 32.0	98 29 04.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 63	34 07 32.0	98 29 03.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 64	34 07 32.0	98 29 01.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 65	34 07 32.0	98 29 00.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 66	34 07 32.0	98 28 58.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 67	34 07 32.0	98 28 57.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 68	34 07 32.0	98 28 55.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 69	34 07 32.0	98 28 54.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 70	34 07 32.0	98 28 52.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 71	34 07 32.0	98 28 51.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 72	34 07 32.0	98 28 49.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 73	34 07 32.0	98 28 48.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 74	34 07 32.0	98 28 46.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 75	34 07 32.0	98 28 45.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 76	34 07 32.0	98 28 43.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 77	34 07 32.0	98 28 42.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 78	34 07 32.0	98 28 40.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 79	34 07 32.0	98 28 39.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 80	34 07 32.0	98 28 37.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 81	34 07 32.0	98 28 36.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 82	34 07 32.0	98 28 34.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 83	34 07 32.0	98 28 33.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 84	34 07 32.0	98 28 31.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 85	34 07 32.0	98 28 30.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 86	34 07 32.0	98 28 28.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 87	34 07 32.0	98 28 27.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 88	34 07 32.0	98 28 25.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 89	34 07 32.0	98 28 24.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 90	34 07 32.0	98 28 22.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 91	34 07 32.0	98 28 21.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 92	34 07 32.0	98 28 19.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 93	34 07 32.0	98 28 18.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 94	34 07 32.0	98 28 16.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 95	34 07 32.0	98 28 15.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 96	34 07 32.0	98 28 13.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 97	34 07 32.0	98 28 12.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 98	34 07 32.0	98 28 10.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 99	34 07 32.0	98 28 09.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 100	34 07 32.0	98 28 07.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 101	34 07 32.0	98 28 06.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 102	34 07 32.0	98 28 04.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 103	34 07 32.0	98 28 03.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 104	34 07 32.0	98 28 01.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 105	34 07 32.0	98 28 00.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 106	34 07 32.0	98 27 58.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 107	34 07 32.0	98 27 57.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 108	34 07 32.0	98 27 55.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 109	34 07 32.0	98 27 54.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 110	34 07 32.0	98 27 52.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 111	34 07 32.0	98 27 51.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 112	34 07 32.0	98 27 49.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 113	34 07 32.0	98 27 48.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 114	34 07 32.0	98 27 46.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 115	34 07 32.0	98 27 45.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 116	34 07 32.0	98 27 43.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 117	34 07 32.0	98 27 42.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 118	34 07 32.0	98 27 40.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 119	34 07 32.0	98 27 39.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 120	34 07 32.0	98 27 37.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 121	34 07 32.0	98 27 36.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 122	34 07 32.0	98 27 34.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 123	34 07 32.0	98 27 33.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 124	34 07 32.0	98 27 31.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 125	34 07 32.0	98 27 30.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 126	34 07 32.0	98 27 28.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 127	34 07 32.0	98 27 27.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 128	34 07 32.0	98 27 25.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 129	34 07 32.0	98 27 24.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 130	34 07 32.0	98 27 22.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 131	34 07 32.0	98 27 21.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 132	34 07 32.0	98 27 19.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 133	34 07 32.0	98 27 18.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 134	34 07 32.0	98 27 16.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 135	34 07 32.0	98 27 15.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 136	34 07 32.0	98 27 13.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 137	34 07 32.0	98 27 12.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 138	34 07 32.0	98 27 10.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 139	34 07 32.0	98 27 09.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 140	34 07 32.0	98 27 07.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 141	34 07 32.0	98 27 06.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 142	34 07 32.0	98 27 04.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 143	34 07 32.0	98 27 03.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 144	34 07 32.0	98 27 01.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 145	34 07 32.0	98 27 00.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 146	34 07 32.0	98 26 58.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 147	34 07 32.0	98 26 57.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 148	34 07 32.0	98 26 55.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 149	34 07 32.0	98 26 54.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 150	34 07 32.0	98 26 52.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 151	34 07 32.0	98 26 51.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 152	34 07 32.0	98 26 49.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 153	34 07 32.0	98 26 48.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 154	34 07 32.0	98 26 46.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 155	34 07 32.0	98 26 45.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 156	34 07 32.0	98 26 43.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 157	34 07 32.0	98 26 42.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 158	34 07 32.0	98 26 40.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 159	34 07 32.0	98 26 39.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 160	34 07 32.0	98 26 37.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 161	34 07 32.0	98 26 36.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 162	34 07 32.0	98 26 34.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 163	34 07 32.0	98 26 33.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 164	34 07 32.0	98 26 31.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 165	34 07 32.0	98 26 30.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 166	34 07 32.0	98 26 28.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 167	34 07 32.0	98 26 27.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 168	34 07 32.0	98 26 25.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 169	34 07 32.0	98 26 24.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 170	34 07 32.0	98 26 22.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 171	34 07 32.0	98 26 21.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 172	34 07 32.0	98 26 19.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 173	34 07 32.0	98 26 18.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 174	34 07 32.0	98 26 16.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 175	34 07 32.0	98 26 15.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 176	34 07 32.0	98 26 13.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 177	34 07 32.0	98 26 12.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 178	34 07 32.0	98 26 10.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 179	34 07 32.0	98 26 09.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 180	34 07 32.0	98 26 07.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 181	34 07 32.0	98 26 06.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 182	34 07 32.0	98 26 04.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 183	34 07 32.0	98 26 03.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 184	34 07 32.0	98 26 01.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 185	34 07 32.0	98 26 00.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 186	34 07 32.0	98 25 58.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 187	34 07 32.0	98 25 57.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 188	34 07 32.0	98 25 55.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 189	34 07 32.0	98 25 54.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 190	34 07 32.0	98 25 52.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 191	34 07 32.0	98 25 51.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 192	34 07 32.0	98 25 49.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 193	34 07 32.0	98 25 48.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 194	34 07 32.0	98 25 46.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 195	34 07 32.0	98 25 45.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 196	34 07 32.0	98 25 43.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 197	34 07 32.0	98 25 42.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 198	34 07 32.0	98 25 40.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 199	34 07 32.0	98 25 39.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 200	34 07 32.0	98 25 37.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 201	34 07 32.0	98 25 36.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 202	34 07 32.0	98 25 34.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 203	34 07 32.0	98 25 33.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 204	34 07 32.0	98 25 31.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 205	34 07 32.0	98 25 30.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 206	34 07 32.0	98 25 28.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 207	34 07 32.0	98 25 27.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 208	34 07 32.0	98 25 25.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 209	34 07 32.0	98 25 24.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 210	34 07 32.0	98 25 22.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 211	34 07 32.0	98 25 21.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 212	34 07 32.0	98 25 19.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 213	34 07 32.0	98 25 18.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 214	34 07 32.0	98 25 16.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 215	34 07 32.0	98 25 15.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 216	34 07 32.0	98 25 13.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 217	34 07 32.0	98 25 12.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 218	34 07 32.0	98 25 10.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 219	34 07 32.0	98 25 09.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 220	34 07 32.0	98 25 07.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 221	34 07 32.0	98 25 06.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 222	34 07 32.0	98 25 04.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 223	34 07 32.0	98 25 03.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 224	34 07 32.0	98 25 01.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 225	34 07 32.0	98 25 00.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 226	34 07 32.0	98 24 58.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 227	34 07 32.0	98 24 57.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 228	34 07 32.0	98 24 55.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 229	34 07 32.0	98 24 54.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 230	34 07 32.0	98 24 52.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 231	34 07 32.0	98 24 51.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 232	34 07 32.0	98 24 49.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 233	34 07 32.0	98 24 48.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 234	34 07 32.0	98 24 46.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 235	34 07 32.0	98 24 45.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 236	34 07 32.0	98 24 43.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 237	34 07 32.0	98 24 42.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 238	34 07 32.0	98 24 40.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 239	34 07 32.0	98 24 39.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 240	34 07 32.0	98 24 37.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 241	34 07 32.0	98 24 36.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 242	34 07 32.0	98 24 34.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 243	34 07 32.0	98 24 33.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 244	34 07 32.0	98 24 31.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 245	34 07 32.0	98 24 30.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 246	34 07 32.0	98 24 28.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 247	34 07 32.0	98 24 27.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 248	34 07 32.0	98 24 25.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 249	34 07 32.0	98 24 24.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 250	34 07 32.0	98 24 22.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 251	34 07 32.0	98 24 21.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 252	34 07 32.0	98 24 19.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 253	34 07 32.0	98 24 18.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 254	34 07 32.0	98 24 16.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 255	34 07 32.0	98 24 15.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 256	34 07 32.0	98 24 13.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 257	34 07 32.0	98 24 12.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 258	34 07 32.0	98 24 10.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 259	34 07 32.0	98 24 09.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 260	34 07 32.0	98 24 07.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 261	34 07 32.0	98 24 06.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 262	34 07 32.0	98 24 04.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 263	34 07 32.0	98 24 03.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 264	34 07 32.0	98 24 01.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 265	34 07 32.0	98 24 00.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 266	34 07 32.0	98 23 58.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 267	34 07 32.0	98 23 57.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 268	34 07 32.0	98 23 55.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 269	34 07 32.0	98 23 54.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 270	34 07 32.0	98 23 52.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 271	34 07 32.0	98 23 51.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 272	34 07 32.0	98 23 49.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 273	34 07 32.0	98 23 48.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 274	34 07 32.0	98 23 46.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 275	34 07 32.0	98 23 45.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 276	34 07 32.0	98 23 43.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 277	34 07 32.0	98 23 42.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 278	34 07 32.0	98 23 40.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 279	34 07 32.0	98 23 39.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 280	34 07 32.0	98 23 37.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 281	34 07 32.0	98 23 36.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 282	34 07 32.0	98 23 34.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 283	34 07 32.0	98 23 33.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 284	34 07 32.0	98 23 31.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 285	34 07 32.0	98 23 30.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 286	34 07 32.0	98 23 28.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 287	34 07 32.0	98 23 27.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 288	34 07 32.0	98 23 25.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 289	34 07 32.0	98 23 24.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 290	34 07 32.0	98 23 22.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 291	34 07 32.0	98 23 21.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 292	34 07 32.0	98 23 19.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 293	34 07 32.0	98 23 18.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 294	34 07 32.0	98 23 16.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 295	34 07 32.0	98 23 15.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 296	34 07 32.0	98 23 13.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 297	34 07 32.0	98 23 12.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 298	34 07 32.0	98 23 10.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 299	34 07 32.0	98 23 09.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 300	34 07 32.0	98 23 07.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 301	34 07 32.0	98 23 06.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 302	34 07 32.0	98 23 04.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 303	34 07 32.0	98 23 03.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 304	34 07 32.0	98 23 01.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 305	34 07 32.0	98 23 00.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 306	34 07 32.0	98 22 58.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 307	34 07 32.0	98 22 57.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 308	34 07 32.0	98 22 55.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 309	34 07 32.0	98 22 54.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 310	34 07 32.0	98 22 52.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 311	34 07 32.0	98 22 51.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 312	34 07 32.0	98 22 49.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 313	34 07 32.0	98 22 48.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 314	34 07 32.0	98 22 46.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 315	34 07 32.0	98 22 45.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 316	34 07 32.0	98 22 43.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 317	34 07 32.0	98 22 42.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 318	34 07 32.0	98 22 40.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 319	34 07 32.0	98 22 39.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 320	34 07 32.0	98 22 37.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 321	34 07 32.0	98 22 36.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 322	34 07 32.0	98 22 34.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 323	34 07 32.0	98 22 33.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 324	34 07 32.0	98 22 31.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 325	34 07 32.0	98 22 30.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 326	34 07 32.0	98 22 28.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 327	34 07 32.0	98 22 27.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 328	34 07 32.0	98 22 25.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 329	34 07 32.0	98 22 24.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 330	34 07 32.0	98 22 22.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 331	34 07 32.0	98 22 21.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 332	34 07 32.0	98 22 19.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 333	34 07 32.0	98 22 18.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 334	34 07 32.0	98 22 16.5	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 335	34 07 32.0	98 22 15.0	1.5	1015.4
R. M. No. 336	34 07 32.0	98 22 13.5	1.

N. Rg. L. 13/12	34	05	57.030	98	30	18.830	12750.7	1057.282
W. P. Sec. 14	34	07	36.580	98	31	52.870	17729.2	1076.254
Miller, U. S. C. & G. S.	34	09	37.958	98	34	25.132	11126.3	1102.988
N. Rg. L. 14/13	34	09	58.398	98	36	35.240	10584.6	1033.088
1/4 Sec. Cor. 34/35	34	09	58.470	98	38	41.190	11856.4	1026.267
W. C. Sec. 5	34	09	17.946	98	40	53.584	10537.6	1055.545
N. Rg. L. 15/14	34	08	41.200	98	42	50.911		1054.841

(c)

Witness Posts.

Witness post.	Latitude.			Longitude.			Dist. (feet)	Elev (feet).
R. M. No. 1	34°	04′	13.730″	98°	30′	18.830″	2138.2	993.546
0	34	04	34.883	98	30	18.830	915.0	956.135
0 plus 1	34	04	41.357	98	30	26.429	706.2	958.022
2	34	04	47.257	98	30	30.921	436.3	961.702
3	34	04	50.225	98	30	34.680	734.7	959.708
4	34	04	52.899	98	30	42.814	1006.4	959.812
5	34	04	58.668	98	30	52.572	1086.8	959.619
6	34	05	07.616	98	30	59.742	444.4	963.746
7	34	05	11.026	98	31	03.081	1434.4	961.651
8	34	05	20.444	98	31	15.844	1501.4	965.385
9	34	05	32.507	98	31	28.006	373.1	965.952
10	34	05	35.149	98	31	31.116	493.6	962.078
11	34	05	37.962	98	31	35.921	1648.0	963.119
12	34	05	46.385	98	31	52.707	567.7	964.8[illegible]
13	34	05	48.929	98	31	58.731	555.7	963.9[illegible]
14	34	05	52.699	98	32	03.542	682.1	965.729
15	34	05	57.775	98	32	08.891	527.1	965.520
16	34	06	01.370	98	32	13.435	521.7	967.304
17	34	06	04.496	98	32	18.373	373.3	967.591
18	34	06	06.703	98	32	21.934	523.4	966.438
19	34	06	10.101	98	32	26.631	565.3	965.602
20	34	06	15.048	98	32	29.776	829.3	968.252
21	34	06	21.917	98	32	35.173	361.0	967.370
22	34	06	25.242	98	32	36.738	271.7	967.[illegible]87
23	34	06	27.916	98	32	37.069	930.3	968.738
23 plus 1	34	06	34.311	98	32	45.027	774.8	970.982

TABLE 2. GEOGRAPHIC POSITIONS AND ELEVATIONS—Continued

Witness post.	Latitude.	Longitude.	Dist. (feet).	Elev. (feet).
23 plus 2	34° 06′ 39.810″	98° 32′ 51.445″	874.8	972.205
23 plus 3	34 06 47.827	98 32 55.302	951.1	975.190
23 plus 4	34 06 53.570	98 33 01.320	482.5	975.327
34	34° 06′ 58.321″	98° 33′ 04.865″	672.1	972.079
35	34 07 04.186	98 33 08.434	154.2	972.507
36	34 07 05.710	98 33 08.713	649.0	972.064
36 plus 1	34 07 06.984	98 33 15.921	898.1	970.172
36 plus 2	34 07 13.787	98 33 22.754	676.3	978.694
36 plus 3	34 07 20.185	98 33 25.061	587.3	983.679
36 plus 4	34 07 23.936	98 33 29.589	561.0	981.904
36 plus 5	34° 07 29.088	98 33 32.068	702.5	981.428
36 plus 6	34 07 34.313	98 33 39.097	946.7	979.878
36 plus 7	34 07 42.895	98 33 43.570	770.7	982.058
36 plus 8	34 07 47.393	98 33 51.113	736.6	981.591
36 plus 9	34 07 51.269	98 33 58.486	489.4	979.343
48	34 07 56.038	98 34 50.494	553.0	981.212
49	34 07 59.202	98 34 04.032		

55	plus 4	34	08	28.964	98	35	01.523	424.6	984.501
55		34	08	33.159	98	35	01.405	.....	987.776
55	plus 4	.....		.....	.....		.....	1088.5	.....
55	plus 1	34	08	35.925	98	35	11.392	1053.5	994.761
55	plus 2	34	08	36.991	98	35	23.873	1149.9	993.895
55	plus 3	34	08	37.013	98	35	37.543	778.2	987.097
55		34	08	41.788	98	35	40.895	491.4	983.256
55		34	08	47.478	98	35	45.706	803.6	992.744
55		34	08	53.887	98	35	51.434	682.4	991.221
55	plus 1	34	08	54.038	98	35	50.553	1067.6	1002.005
55	plus 2	34	08	54.634	98	36	12.210	1077.5	992.042
55	plus 3	34	08	54.057	98	36	25.044	575.5	990.478
55		34	08	58.940	98	36	21.516	330.5	990.411
55		34	08	58.227	98	36	25.355	500.0	988.491
55		34	08	58.085	98	36	31.304	388.7	987.701
55		34	08	57.350	98	36	35.237	1113.3	984.289
55	plus 1	34	08	54.564	98	36	48.056	1730.0	1003.975
55		34	09	01.901	98	37	06.659	618.4	993.074
55		34	09	04.604	98	37	13.266	242.2	992.288
55		34	09	05.028	98	37	16.104	224.7	990.536
55		34	09	05.862	98	37	18.583	222.7	992.000
55		34	09	07.134	98	37	20.746	673.6	995.413
55		34	09	13.482	98	37	23.178	520.5	992.202
55		34	09	18.279	98	37	25.427	1143.7	991.116
55		34	09	26.556	98	37	31.709	390.3	994.897
55		34	09	30.177	98	37	36.321	323.1	992.952
55		34	09	33.290	98	37	35.448	887.2	996.414
55	plus 1	34	09	35.916	98	37	45.528	956.1	999.671
55	plus 2	34	09	31.675	98	37	56.809	1060.5	997.833

R. M. No. 6		34	08	09.047	98	34	29.565	.....	990.602
55		.....		.....	.....		.....	1153.5	.....
55	plus 1	34	08	16.521	98	34	33.716	797.5	990.264
55	plus 2	34	08	19.970	98	34	42.256	746.8	986.967
55	plus 3	34	08	24.477	98	34	49.299	1122.9	983.921

TABLE 2. GEOGRAPHIC POSITIONS AND ELEVATIONS—Continued

Witness post.	Latitude.	Longitude.	Dist. (feet).	Elev. (feet).
R. M. No. 10	34° 09′ 36.295″	98° 38′ 09.282″	384.4	996.268
101	34 09 39.414	98 38 11.905	805.9	999.188
102	34 09 37.086	98 38 21.071	410.4	996.901
102 plus 1	34 09 35.440	98 38 25.536	326.0	996.164
102 plus 2	34 09 34.264	98 38 21.921	615.5	1004.765
102 plus 3	34 09 30.204	98 38 27.380	594.1	1007.189
102 plus 4	34 09 25.701	98 38 31.924	775.0	1005.294
102 plus 5	34 09 18.905	98 38 36.195	756.4	1011.559
102 plus 6	34 09 11.970	98 38 39.573	709.4	1001.529
102 plus 7	34 09 05.060	98 38 40.163	821.2	1007.171
109	34 08 58.360	98 38 45.582	806.9	1007.709
110	34 09 60.279	98 38 51.883	556.5	1003.552
111	34 08 58.942	98 39 01.321	269.5	1000.534
111 plus 1	34 08 57.341	98 39 03.784	1019.7	1013.405
114	34 08 47.856	98 39 07.894	476.1	1006.941
115	34 08 50.750	98 39 12.360	327.8	1003.089
116	34 08 48.761	98 39 15.444	172.0	1004.291
117	34 08 47.021	98 39 16.967	322.4	1026.762
118	34 08 46.334	98 39 20.477	146.7	1004.089
119	34 08 45.267	98 39 21.661	325.6	1005.649

| | | |

TABLE 2. GEOGRAPHIC POSITIONS AND ELEVATIONS—Continued

Witness post.	Latitude.	Longitude.	Dist. (feet).	Elev. (feet).
156				
157	34° 08′ 08.436″	98° 40′ 56.000″	220.9	1009.856
158	34 08 07.209	98 40 58.175	130.0	1010.132
159	34 08 07.081	98 40 59.717	114.4	1010.161
160	34 08 06.804	98 41 01.036	175.9	1010.254
161	34 08 06.156	98 41 02.480	261.6	1011.109
162	34 08 04.314	98 41 05.168	316.4	1012.589
163	34 08 02.725	98 41 08.411	324.8	1012.877
164	34 08 01.629	98 41 12.043	318.9	1014.135
165	34 08 01 876	98 41 15.765	350.3	1016.944
166	34 08 00.397	98 41 19.526	252.8	1011.401
167	34 07 58.886	98 41 21.934	371.0	1015.186
168	34 07 57.055	98 41 25.769	292.5	1012.405
169	34 07 54.994	98 41 28.203	376.2	1013.536
170	34 07 52.142	98 41 31.090	712.1	1016.206
171	34 07 47.359	98 41 37.309	588.2	1013.766
172	34 07 43.716	98 41 42.680	566.0	1014.702
173	34 07 40.765	98 41 48.413	471.0	1021.654
174	34 07 38 370	98 41 53 215	767.7	1021.3668
175	34 07 35.143	98 42 01 483	882.3	1015.166
176	34 07 31.830	98 42 12.468	567.9	1017.401
177	34 07 29.982	98 42 18.727		

Table 2, Continued.

(d)

Bench Marks

B. M. 1. Elevation, 1002.333 Feet.

Burkburnett, about 5 miles northwest of, about ½ mile northeast of Bradley's Corner; on hill overlooking Red River valley; on property of Magna Oil and Refining Company, about 30 feet south of office, 1.5 feet west of fence on east line of property; standard iron post, stamped "No. 1 Elev. 1002.2."

Latitude 34°08′ 29.749″; longitude 98°37′ 51.362″.

B. M. 2. Elevation, 1009.115 Feet.

Burkburnett, about 4½ miles northwest of; about 1¾ miles northeast of Bradley's Corner; about 1 mile west of south end of Devol bridge over Red River; about ½ mile north of bluff; 250 feet south of Bridgetown-Devol road; 100 feet west of telephone line; on west end of high sand ridge; standard iron post stamped "No 2. Elev. 1009.0"

Latitude 34°08′ 51.594″; longitude 98°36′ 48.056″.

B. M. 3. Elevation, 1004.062 Feet.

Burkburnett, about 5½ miles northwest of; about 1 mile northeast of Bradley's Corner; about 1 mile southwest of west end of Goat Island; about ½ mile north of bluff; on west end of sand ridge; 300 feet north of Bridgetown-Devol road, standard iron post stamped "No. 3. Elev. 1003.9."

Latitude 34°09′ 00.444″; longitude 98°37′ 41.864″.

B. M. 4. Elevation, 1004.430 Feet.

Burkburnett, about 7 miles northwest of; about 1 mile northeast of Bridgetown; ¾ mile east of Grandfield bridge over Red River, 800 feet north of bluff, about 200 feet north of pump house; 15 feet south of road from Grandfield bridge to Devol bridge; standard iron post stamped "No. 4. Elev. 1004.3."

Latitude 34°08′ 40.355″; longitude 98°39′ 27.621″.

B. M. 5. Elevation, 1009.373 Feet.

Bridgetown, ½ mile north of; about 650 feet southwest of south end of Grandfield bridge over Red River; at southeast corner of United States Receivership office; standard iron post stamped "No. 5. Elev. 1009.3."

Latitude 34°08′ 29.466″; longitude 98°40′ 09.353″.

B. M. 6. Elevation, 1111.

Bridgetown; east side of the main road;
west corner of galvanized iron fence and road
post stamped "No. 6. Elev. 1111.8."
Latitude 34°08′ 11.501″; longitude 98°4

B. M. 7. Elevation, 1117.

Bridgetown, 1¼ miles southwest of; 1,00
house in grove on south side of road; abou
west; in fence line, on highest part of ri
stamped "No. 7. Elev. 1117.2."
Latitude 34°07′ 42.259″; longitude 98°4

B. M. 8. Elevation, 1020.0

Bridgetown, 1½ miles southwest of; on ba
south of channel; 60 feet southeast of mouth
east of clump of three elm trees; standard i
Elev. 1019.9."
Latitude 34°07′ 46.256″; longitude 98°4

B. M. 9. Elevation, 1024.3

Bridgetown; 2¾ miles southwest of; 60 fe
River; on point of ridge on west side of small
west of 12-inch elm tree; standard iron post
1024.2."
Latitude 34°07′ 23.258″; longitude 98°42

B. M. 10. Elevation, 1011.9

Burkburnett, 2 miles northwest of; about
west of south end of Wichita Falls & North
over Red River; about 150 feet west of curve i
southeast of northeast corner of net fence; n
ard iron post stamped "No. 10. Elev. 1011.
Latitude 34°07′ 34.826″; longitude 98°33

B. M. 11. Elevation, 978.69

Burkburnett, 2 miles north of; 500 feet we
south of twin cottonwood trees; on sand rid
stamped "No. 11. Elev. 978.55"
Latitude 34°07′ 06.418″; longitude 98°33

B. M. 12. Elevation, 994.62

Burkburnett bridge over Red River, about 1
west of Witness Post No. 12; 80 feet east of fen

River; in west fence line; standard bronze tablet set in sand-stone outcrop, stamped "964.6."
Latitude 34°05' 47.296"; longitude 98°31' 54.876".

B. M. 13. Elevation, 969.393 Feet.

Burkburnett, about 2½ miles east of; 1 mile west of Burkburnett toll bridge; about 1,000 feet west of pumping plant; 200 feet south of slough; 150 feet northwest of spring; 40 feet north of 20-inch elm tree; 30 feet west of road; 2 feet east of fence corner at foot of bluff; standard iron post stamped "969.4."
Latitude 34°06' 35.416"; longitude 98°33' 13.675".

On March 26, 1923, before entering upon our work, we appeared before C. Elmore Cropley, Notary Public of the District of Columbia, in the office of the Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States, and subscribed to the following oath:

"I, (Arthur D. Kidder and Arthur A. Stiles, subscribed individually), having been appointed one of the Commissioners to run, locate and mark the state line between the States of Oklahoma and Texas in accordance with the Partial Decree Relating to State Boundary entered March 12, 1923, and the opinion of this Court delivered January 15, 1923, do solemnly swear that I will faithfully and impartially perform the duties of the office upon which I am about to enter, to the best of my abilities, and that I will support the Constitution of the United States. So help me God."

A statement of the time employed and the expense incurred in the performance of the work will be the subject of a later report.
Five copies each of the report and maps have been today sent by registered mail to the Attorney General of the United States, the Attorney General of Texas and the Attorney General of Oklahoma. We also have filed with the clerk of the court fifty copies of the report and maps for the use of such private interveners as may apply for them. Thirty additional copies of the report and maps have been filed with the clerk for such disposition as the court may direct.
The originals of the three maps hereinbefore named are bound with the original report, and appear in the following order: Map No. 1, Map No. 2, Sheets Nos. 1 and 2, and Map No. 3, Sheets Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4.

Respectfully submitted.

ARTHUR D. KIDDER,
ARTHUR A. STILES,
Commissioners.

Washington, D. C., April 25, 1924.

MAP No. 1

TOPOGRAPHIC MAP OF BIG BEND AREA
DECEMBER 1, 1943



MAP NO. 3

TOPOGRAPHIC MAP OF BIG BEND AREA
DECEMBER 31, 1923





TEXAS AND OKLAHOMA BOUNDARY

[illegible] AREA

[illegible]

Map No. 1



OKLAHOMA BOUNDARY

672

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

No. 15, Original.—October Term, 1923.

State of Oklahoma, Complainant,
vs.
State of Texas, Defendant, the United States, Intervener.

[June 9, 1924.]

1. The motion of the defendant, the State of Texas, for leave to file an amended counter-claim relating to the interstate boundary along the one hundredth meridian is granted; and the complainant, the State of Oklahoma, and the intervener, the United States of America, are severally given until and including the first Monday of October next within which to answer such amended counter-claim.

2. On consideration of the response made by J. H. Dubon and H. J. Kebideaux to the order to show cause issued against them on May 5, 1924, such response is found insufficient and it is ordered that an injunction be issued directing that they dismiss the action brought by them against the receiver in this cause in the District Court of Wichita County, Texas, and that they refrain from taking any other proceeding or step in that action.

3. The report of the boundary commissioners of the survey and platting of the medial line of Red River in the vicinity of the river-bed wells, pursuant to the order of June 4, 1923, 262 U. S. 505, is approved and adopted. The report of such commissioners of the time employed and expense incurred in that work is also approved, and the receiver is directed to pay the sums specified in such report and to charge the same against the impounded funds derived from the river-bed wells.

4. On consideration of the motion of the State of Texas that the receiver pay out of the proceeds of the receivership wells south of the interstate boundary the production tax prescribed by the laws of that State, it is ordered that the receiver be authorized,

out of the impounded proceeds from every such well, to pay such tax in respect of such impounded proceeds and to charge the same against such well as an expense specially pertaining to it. But before making any such payment the receiver shall request the Attorney General of the State of Texas, and the parties interested in the fund from which the payment is to be made, to submit to him definite statements showing the amount of the tax and whether it has been otherwise paid. If in any instance the receiver is in doubt respecting the propriety of the payment he shall withhold it and report the matter to this Court for further instructions.

5. The receiver is instructed to distribute *pro rata* over the impounded funds in his custody all interest received on receivership moneys, all discounts collected and all other similar items of profit arising from the general operations or business of the receivership, and not from particular wells.

6. The receiver is authorized to take all proper steps to obtain payment of all accounts and claims that may be due or owing to him as such receiver and to report to the Court at its next term all of such accounts and claims as then may remain unpaid with his recommendations respecting the measures to be taken to enforce payment.

7. The receiver is directed to publish a final notice to all persons asserting or holding claims against him or the receivership arising out of matters accruing since the claims' notice of June 1, 1921, to present such claims within forty days after the first publication of such notice, in default of which the claims will be barred.

8. The receiver is instructed to make no reimbursement, under the order of June 1, 1921, 258 U. S. 607, or otherwise, to any operator or driller for work done on any river-bed well prior to the receivership where the well has proved to be a dry hole or unproductive; and all applications and suggestions that reimbursement be made for such work are overruled.

9. The receiver is instructed to spread the general expenses of the receivership over all the impounded funds in his custody in such way that each dollar in the funds derived from river-bed wells, and in those derived from flood-plain wells which have remained in the operation of the receiver, will bear twice as much of such expenses as each dollar in the funds derived from flood-plain wells which have been operated by private claimants will bear. The spreading shall be made evenly over all moneys in the

funds bearing the lesser share of the expenses, and evenly over all moneys in the funds bearing the larger share. No distinction shall be made between moneys going to owners of flood-plain wells and moneys going to lessees of such wells. Neither shall be exempted and the spreading over the two shall be on a *pro rata* basis.

10. All expenses and losses incident to work done by the receiver on river-bed wells which proved unremunerative shall be charged against the funds derived from remunerative wells in the river bed.

11. The receiver is authorized to pay to Tom Testermann the sum received by the receiver on the sale by him of equipment belonging to Mr. Testermann which had come into the possession of the receiver.

12. The petition of Tom Testermann asking that he be reimbursed out of funds enuring to the Bass Petroleum Company, its successor or assigns, for the conversion by such company, prior to the receivership, of property claimed by Mr. Testermann is denied.

13. Notwithstanding the exception of well No. 139, known as the Burk-Senator well, from the order of June 1, 1921, 256 U. S. 607, the receiver is authorized, in his discretion, to reimburse the operators who drilled that well prior to the receivership for the cost of that work, if the operators who participated therein are disposed to adjust the differences between them and to accept a reimbursement which is satisfactory to the receiver.

14. The receiver is authorized to surrender to the Secretary of the Interior, as the representative of the United States, the possession of all of the south half of the river bed, now in the receivership, with all oil wells, pipe lines and other property pertaining to such river bed,—the surrender to be made at the close of business on the 30th of June, 1924, or as soon thereafter as the Secretary of the Interior is prepared to take over that property.

15. The receiver is authorized to deliver to the Secretary of the Interior, as the representative of the United States, at the time of the surrender named in the last paragraph the office buildings, equipment and supplies belonging to the receivership and intended for use in its oil and gas operations,—the delivery to be at a valuation agreed upon between the Secretary of the Interior and the receiver. The agreed price shall be charged to the United States and credited to the receiver as a partial payment to the former of the money enuring to it as proceeds of river-bed wells.

16. The receiver is authorized to pay over to the Secretary of the Interior, as the representative of the United States, at the time of the surrender and delivery named in the last two paragraphs approximately two-thirds of the net impounded funds derived from the river-bed wells.

17. The receiver is authorized to surrender to the several owners or lessees entitled thereto, as soon as arrangements therefor satisfactorily can be made, the possession of the flood-plain wells which he is now operating, together with the pipe lines and fixtures pertaining to them. If there be controversy or doubt as to who is entitled to any particular well the receiver shall withhold its surrender for the time being and pursue the course indicated in the next paragraph of this order.

18. The receiver is instructed to publish notice to all claimants to funds in his custody derived from flood-plain wells (meaning wells south of the interstate boundary as now established) to present their claims to such funds within forty days after the first publication of such notice,—the presentation to be in the form of a definite statement of what is claimed and of the claimant's title. After the expiration of twenty days more the receiver shall be authorized, where there are no conflicting claims, to pay the proceeds from any well or wells, less expenses and charges, to the proper claimant or claimants. If there be controversy or doubt as to who is entitled to the proceeds from any well the receiver shall withhold action as to such proceeds and report the matter to this Court at its next term for further instructions.

19. The receiver is directed to have all of his accounts audited as of the close of business on June 30, 1924, by an expert public accountant designated by the Chief Justice.

A true copy.

Test:

Clerk, Supreme Court, U. S.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1923

No. 15, Original

THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA, COMPLAINANT,

vs.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, DEFENDANT,
THE UNITED STATES, INTERVENER

REPORT OF SPECIAL LINE SURVEY

ARTHUR D. KIDDER,
ARTHUR A. STILES,
Commissioners.

Washington, D. C., October 25, 1924.

Press of R. Donnelley & Sons Co. Printers Washington D. C.

080

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1923

No. 15, Original

THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA, Complainant,

vs.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Defendant;
THE UNITED STATES, Intervener

REPORT OF MEDIAL LINE SURVEY.

To the Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States:

In obedience to and in conformity with the order of June 4, 1923 (262 U. S. 505), we have surveyed and run upon the ground and have delineated upon an appropriate map the medial line between the state boundary along the south bank of Red River and the northerly bank thereof for a distance of three miles in the vicinity of the river bed oil wells, and we beg to submit this joint report of that work, with field notes and map

The survey was begun June 29, 1923, and completed February 17, 1924. The location of the medial line, as so established and delineated, conforms to the physical situation existing on December 31, 1923, the date as of which we ran, located and marked the boundary between the States of Texas and Oklahoma along the receivership oil area as shown and described in our report thereof filed contemporaneously with this report.

Besides locating the state boundary along the south bank as shown in the other report, a meander line of the north bank was run in the usual manner, for purposes of accurate platting and to aid in determining the location of the medial line. Temporary markers were placed at the angle points along the north bank.

The establishment of the medial line conforms specifically to the provisions of the fifth paragraph of the decree of March 12, 1923 (261 U. S. 345), entitled "Supplement to Partial Decree of June 5, 1922," which paragraph reads as follows

"5. In the sense intended herein, the medial line of the river is a line drawn midway between the northerly and southerly banks of the river, commonly called cut banks, save that, under a stipulation between the parties affected, to which full effect must be given, this line, in so far as it reaches and is in contact with patented or allotted tracts which are within what is now the bed of the river, shall be regarded and treated as falling no farther north than the southerly line

of such tracts as the same were represented by the official survey a
cording to which they were patented or allotted."

To carry out those provisions, the 1875 meander line of Sec.
of Township 5 South, Range 14 West, of the Indian Meridian,
Oklahoma, was retraced and reestablished, because that line for
the southerly line of patented or allotted tracts, which are with
what is now the bed of the river, as such southerly line was rep
sented by the official survey of the United States according to wh
those tracts were patented or allotted. The meander line of 187
was retraced and reestablished in conformity with the rules stat
in the Manual of Instructions for the Survey of the Public Lan
of the United States, with markers located in new positions.

The location of the medial line was then determined by runnin
twenty-three cross-sections of the river, by accurate measurement
from bank to bank to determine the exact mid-point position
These mid-points were then connected by straight and curved lin
in a manner designed to produce a true and connected medial li
conforming to the directions and curves of the two banks, con
sidered together. Markers were placed in the river bed to sho
and aid in retracing the line. A number of the markers are im
mediately on the medial line, but some are only near to it and
are in the nature of witness posts, being connected up with the li
by course and distance as shown in the field notes.

All of these markers are heavy iron pipe, called "drill-stem,"
inches in diameter, 20 ft. long, driven through the sand into th
hard clay and shale of the river bed, leaving 30 inches exposed
The material, outfit and crew for this work were furnished by th
Receiver in this suit. Bronze tablets were placed in the tops of th
pipes, each tablet being marked as indicated upon the map.

The map which forms a part of this report, is more specifically
identified as Map No. 2 of the boundary survey, and is a cadastr
map of the oil field region, in two sheets, Nos. 1 and 2, scale 5
feet to the inch.

All oil wells within 300 ft. of the medial line have been accurately
located and are shown in the field notes and upon the map.

The field notes follow:

Meanders of North Bank.

Beginning at Witness Post No. 100, near the north point of the "Big Bend," as such post is described in the field notes of the boundary survey, and from which post a point on the south bank of the river bears N. 15° W., 16 ft. dist.; thence

N. 11° 00′ W., on river cross-section, 2157.5 ft. (32.690 chs.), to angle point No. 200 on north bank of river.

Thence with meanders of north bank of river, upstream.

Bearing.	Distance.	Angle point.
S. 79° 43′ W.	726.1 ft. (11.001 chs.) to A. P.	201
S. 77° 46′ W.	864.9 " (13.104 ") " "	202
S. 72° 40′ W.	515.9 " (7.817 ") " "	203

From A. P. 203, the ¼ sec. cor. between sections 31 and 35, T. 4 S., R. 14 W., bears North, 273.2 ft. (4.139 chs.) dist.; thence from A. P. 203

S. 85° 14′ W.	362.6 ft.	(5.494 chs.)	to A. P.	204
S. 70° 20′ W.	1343.7 "	(20.359 ")	" "	205
S. 85° 46′ W.	367.4 "	(5.566 ")	" "	206
S. 75° 32′ W.	480.3 "	(7.277 ")	" "	207
S. 68° 40′ W.	412.4 "	(6.249 ")	" "	208
S. 77° 56′ W.	1081.5 "	(16.387 ")	" "	209
S. 70° 10′ W.	1019.5 "	(15.447 ")	" "	210
S. 77° 12′ W.	378.0 "	(5.729 ")	" "	211

From A. P. 211, the ¼ sec. cor. between sections 33 and 34, T. 4 S., R. 14 W., bears North, 1639.3 ft. (24.838 chs.) dist.; thence from A. P. 211

Bearing.	Distance.			Angle point.
S. 73° 12′ W.	330.7 ft.	(5.010 chs)	to A. P.	212
S. 61° 01′ W.	414.6 "	(6.282 ")	" "	213
S. 71° 54′ W.	299.2 "	(4.533 ")	" "	214
S. 62° 50′ W.	1100.4 "	(16.673 ")	" "	215
S. 51° 44′ W.	148.4 "	(2.248 ")	" "	216

From A. P. 216, the meander corner between sections 4 and 33, on the line between Townships 4 and 5 South, Range 14 West, bears West, 104.9 ft. (1.589 chs.) dist.; thence from A. P. 216

Bearing	Distance.			Angle point.
S. 50° 25′ W.	137.4 ft.	(2.082 chs.)	to A. P.	217
S. 38° 15′ W.	644.5 "	(9.765 ")	" "	218
S. 49° 53′ W.	171.7 "	(2.602 ")	" "	219
S. 38° 41′ W.	384.1 "	(5.820 ")	" "	220
S. 27° 37′ W.	174.8 "	(2.649 ")	" "	221
S. 42° 29′ W.	218.8 "	(3.315 ")	" "	222
S. 54° 38′ W.	196.2 "	(2.972 ")	" "	223
S. 64° 54′ W.	334.9 "	(5.074 ")	" "	224
S. 55° 19′ W.	831.6 "	(12.600 ")	" "	225
S. 50° 44′ W.	503.8 "	(7.634 ")	" "	226
S. 67° 20′ W.	970.5 "	(14.704 ")	" "	227

At 568.1 ft. (8.607 chs.) on the above course, intersect N. & S. line at a point from which the meander corner between sections 4 and 5, T. 5 S., R. 14 W., bears North, 686.6 ft. (10.403 chs.) dist., thence from A. P. 227

Bearing	Distance			Angle point
S. 60° 04' W.	282.5 ft.	(4.280 chs.)	to A. P.	228
S. 73° 44' W.	276.3 "	(4.187 ")	" "	229
N. 64° 48' W.	374.4 "	(5.673 ")	" "	230
N. 69° 48' W.	344.1 "	(5.214 ")	" "	231
N. 75° 49' W.	429.6 "	(6.509 ")	" "	232
N. 86° 40' W.	625.0 "	(9.469 ")	" "	233

From A. P. 233, a witness post bears N. 1° 55' W., 80.4 ft. (1.218 chs.) dist.; thence from A. P. 233

Bearing	Distance			Angle point
S. 68° 16' W.	204.5 ft.	(3.098 chs.)	to A. P.	234
S. 58° 02' W.	461.5 "	(6.992 ")	" "	235
S. 58° 15' W.	648.6 "	(9.827 ")	" "	236
S. 61° 52' W.	710.4 "	(10.763 ")	" "	237
S. 46° 23' W.	478.8 "	(7.255 ")	" "	238
S. 41° 57' W.	602.0 "	(9.121 ")	" "	239
S. 60° 27' W.	949.9 "	(14.392 ")	" "	240

At 157.2 ft. (2.382 chs.) on the above course, intersect the line between sections 5 and 6, T. 5 S., R. 14 W., at a point from which the ¼ sec. cor. bears N. 0° 15' W., 1789.6 ft. (27.115 chs.) dist.; thence from A. P. 240

Bearing	Distance			Angle point
S. 51° 55' W.	326.8 ft.	(4.951 chs.)	to A. P.	241
S. 44° 48' W.	515.8 "	(7.815 ")	" "	242

At 368.0 ft. (5.575 chs.) on the above course, intersect the line between sections 6 and 7, T. 5 S., R. 14 W., at a point from which the ¼ sec. cor. bears N. 89° 29' W., 1433.5 ft. (21.720 chs.) dist.; thence from A. P. 242

Bearing.	Distance			Angle point
S. 49° 10' W.	372.5 ft.	(5.644 chs.)	to A. P.	243
S. 46° 28' W.	270.4 "	(4.097 ")	" "	244
S. 38° 14' W.	343.0 "	(5.197 ")	" "	245
S. 60° 04' W.	214.0 "	(3.242 ")	" "	246
S. 53° 53' W.	340.4 "	(5.158 ")	" "	247
S. 40° 25' W.	516.1 "	(7.819 ")	" "	248
S. 61° 12' W.	391.4 "	(5.931 ")	" "	249
S. 73° 28' W.	1043.7 "	(15.814 ")	" "	250
S. 71° 06' W.	586.0 "	(8.121 ")	" "	251
S. 67° 35' W.	663.3 "	(10.050 ")	" "	252

From A. P. 252, North Range Line Station 15/11, of the boundary survey, bears North, 2422.0 ft. (36.698 chs.) dist.; from the same angle point the corner of sections 1, 6, 7 and 12, on the line between Townships 5 and

Re-establishment of 1875 Meander Line, Section 8, T. 5 S., R. 14 W.

Beginning at the ¼ sec. cor. between secs. 5 and 6, T. 5 S., R. 14 W., which is an iron post marked and witnessed by one bearing tree as described in the official field notes on file in the General Land Office, thence

S. 0° 15′ E., between secs. 5 and 6, 2640.7 ft. (40.01 chs.), to true point for cor. of secs. 5, 6, 7 and 8, in the river bed, unmarked.

Beginning again at the ¼ sec. cor. between secs. 6 and 7, T. 5 S., R. 14 W., which is a sandstone and iron post as described in the official field notes, thence

S. 89° 29′ E., between secs. 6 and 7, 2651.9 ft. (40.18 chs.), to true point for cor. of secs. 5, 6, 7 and 8; thence

East, between secs. 5 and 8, 1959.5 ft. (29.69 chs.), to true point for 1875 meander corner, in river bed; set a drill stem marker as previously described.

Returning to true point for cor. of secs. 5, 6, 7 and 8, thence

South, between secs. 7 and 8, 3070.3 ft. (46.52 chs.), to true point for 1875 meander corner, in river bed; set a drill stem marker as previously described.

After having run the river bed cross-sections as hereinbefore described, it is found that the medial line intersects the 1875 meander line of section 7 at a point S. 59° 30′ W., 104.9 ft. (1.590 chs.) counting from the meander corner of secs. 7 and 8, said medial line is shown upstream upon the map, but has not been marked in the river bed.

Thence from the meander corner of sections 7 and 8, running downstream with re-establishment of the 1875 meander line, setting drill stem markers for angle points in Sec. 8, T. 5 S., R. 14 W.

Bearing.	Distance.		Angle point.
N. 68° 56′ E.	969.3 ft.	(14.686 chs.)	to A. P. 1, Sec. 8
N. 22° 00′ E.	988.6 "	(14.979 ")	" " 2, " "
N. 21° 45′ E.	1318.1 "	(19.971 ")	" " 3, " "

At 145.8 ft. (2.209 chs.) on the above course, set a drill stem with bronze tablet marked "INITIAL POINT MEDIAL LINE", at 369.0 ft. (5.59 chs.) on the same course, intersect the medial line according to its position on December 31, 1923, this point is not marked. At this point the medial line departs from the position of the 1875 meander line, running downstream as shown upon the map and more specifically hereinafter described.

Thence from A. P. 3, Sec. 8

N. 18° 30′ E., 614.9 ft. (9.317 chs.) to the 1875 meander corner between secs. 5 and 8, previously described.

South, between Ranges 14 and 15 West, bears North, 24520 ft. (37.152 chs.) dist.

Traverse of Medial Line Markers.

Beginning at the "Initial Point" of the medial line, on the 1875 meander line of Sec 8, T. 3 S, R. 14 W, which marker is located at a point S. 21° 45' W., 223.2 ft. from the December 31, 1923, position of the medial line, previously described, thence with traverse of medial line markers running downstream, with connections to true medial line position

Bearing	Distance.	Witness post			Connections to true medial line position.	
S. 87° 10' E.	112.9 ft.	to W. P.	M. P.		2 N. 8° 35' W.,	215.0 ft
	1.710 chs.					
N. 84° 25' E.	471.6 ft.	"	"	"	3 N. 28° 00' W.,	390.3 "
	7.145 chs.					
N. 71° 33' E.	325.6 ft.	"	"	P. C.	N. 29° 00' W.,	160.0 "
	4.933 chs.					
Counting again from W. P. M. P. 3						
N. 71° 04' E.	890.7 ft.	"	"	M. P.	4 N. 29° 00' W.,	558.0 "
	13.496 chs.					
N. 70° 01' E.	1028.5 ft.	"	"	"	5 N. 29° 00' W.,	715.0 "
	15.581 chs.					
N. 60° 18' E.	461.1 ft.	"	"	"	6 N. 31° 45' W.,	709.5 "
	6.987 chs.					
N. 65° 52' E.	1529.2 ft.	"	"	"	7 N. 65° 45' W.,	699.0 "
	23.034 chs.				N. 20° 00' E.,	260.7 "
N. 39° 05' E.	913.2 ft.	"		"	8 On true line.	
	13.837 chs.					
S. 21° 56' W.	204.4 ft.	"		P. T.	" " "	
	3.097 chs.					
Counting again from M. P. 8						
N. 40° 35' E.	506.2 ft.	"		M. P.	9 " " "	
	7.670 chs.					
N. 59° 14' E.	1367.2 ft.	"				

29.717 chs.

From M. P. 10, Witness Corner Sec. 5, of the boundary survey, bears N. 55° 19' W., 36512 ft. (55.322 chs.) dist.; thence from M. P. 10

Bearing	Distance		Witness post		Connections to true medial line position		
N. 63° 39' E.	584.6 ft.,	to	M. P. 11	On true line.			
	8.858 chs.						
N. 62° 43' E.	1179.3 ft.	"	" 12	"	"	"	
	17.868 chs.						
N. 60° 14' E.	934.1 ft.	"	" 13	"	"	"	
	14.153 chs.						
N. 68° 44' E.	1055.5 ft.	"	" 14	"	"	"	
	15.992 chs.						
N. 56° 58' E.	939.7 ft.	"	" 15	"	"	"	
	14.283 chs.						
N. 64° 38' E.	1094.1 ft.	"	" 16	"	"	"	
	16.578 chs.						
N. 72° 18' E.	546.3 ft.	"	P. C.		"	"	"
	8.277 chs.						
N. 59° 54' E.	615.3 ft.	"	P. T.		"	"	"
	9.322 chs.						
N. 47° 29' E.	784.3 ft.	"	M. P. 17		"	"	"
	11.883 chs.						
N. 49° 55' E.	1231.2 ft.	"	W. P. M. P. 18		S. 27° 45' E.,		89.1 ft.
	18.655 chs.				N. 73° 15' E.,		452.1 "
N. 60° 23' E.	925.2 ft.	"	"	"	19	S. 22° 45' E.,	75.9 "
	14.018 chs.						

From W. P. M. P. 19, ¼ Sec. Cor. 34-35, of the boundary survey, bears N. 18° 05' W., 14973 ft. (22.686 chs.) dist.

From W. P. M. P. 19, the medial line is shown downstream upon the map, but has not been marked in the river bed. The total distance marked is three miles.

Oil Wells Within 300 Ft. of Medial Line.

Oil Wells in Patented or Allotted River-bed Tracts, North of Medial Line.

Staley-Wynne' Owens No. 1.

From the meander corner of Secs. 7 and 8, Staley Wynne' Owe Well No. 1 bears N. 28° 05' W., 316.2 ft. dist. This well is in L 7, Sec. 7, T. 5 S., R. 14 W. The meander corner is the nearest poi

Capshaw No. 1.

From Angle Point No. 1, Sec. 8, Capshaw Well No. 1 bears S. 7 03' W., 174.0 ft. dist. This well is in Lot 1, Sec. 8, T. 5 S., R 1 W. The nearest point on the 1875 meander line bears S. 21° E 21.6 ft. dist.

Capshaw No. 2.

From Angle Point No. 1, Sec. 8, Capshaw Well No. 2 bears N. 12 20' E., 315.2 ft. dist. This well is in Lot 2, Sec. 8, T. 5 S., R. 14 W The nearest point on the 1875 meander line bears S. 65° E., 93 ft. dist.

Capshaw No. 3.

From Witness Post Mid-Point No. 2, Capshaw Well No. 3 bears S. 55° 52' W., 451.5 ft. dist. This well is in Lot 2, Sec. 8, T. 5 S., R. 14 W. The nearest point on the 1875 meander line bears S. 65° E., 144 ft. dist.

Marshall.

From Witness Post Mid-Point No. 2, the Marshall well bears N. 1° 52' E., 581.6 ft. dist. This well is in Lot 3, Sec. 8, T. 5 S., R. 14 W. The nearest point on the medial line bears S. 30° 30' E., 257 ft. dist.

Other Oil Wells North of Medial Line.

Okla.-Texas' Gobbler No. 1.

From Mid-Point No. 11, Okla.-Texas' Gobbler Well No. 1 bears N. 0° 28' E., 199.2 ft. dist. This well is in the river bed north of the medial line. The nearest point on the medial line bears S. 20° 00' E., 181 ft. dist.

Okla.-Texas' Gobbler No. 3.

From Mid-Point No. 11, Okla.-Texas' Gobbler Well No. 3 bears N. 46° 32' E., 402.0 ft. dist. This well is in the river bed north of the medial line. The nearest point on the medial line bears S. 25° 45' E., 132 ft. dist.

Okla.-Texas' Goehler No. 4.

From Mid-Point No. 11, Okla.-Texas' Goehler Well No. 4 bears N. 54° 39' E., 602.5 ft dist. This well is in the river bed north of the medial line. The nearest point on the medial line bears S. 25° 39' E., 129 ft. dist.

Okla.-Texas' Goehler No. 5.

From Mid Point No. 11, Okla.-Texas' Goehler Well No. 5 bears N. 55° 14' E., 576 ft. dist. This well is in the river bed north of the medial line. The nearest point on the medial line bears S. 31° 00' E., 144 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 143.

From Mid-Point No. 15, F. R. 143 bears N. 7° 20' W., 366 ft. dist. This well is in the river bed north of the medial line. The nearest point on the medial line bears S. 31° 00' E., 333 ft. dist.

Oil Wells South of Medial Line.

F. R. No. 181.

From Angle Point No. 1, Sec. 8, T. 5 S., R. 14 W., F. R. 181 bears S. 33° 20' E., 182.9 ft dist. This well is in the river bed southeast of Lot 1, Sec. 8. Angle Point No. 1 is the nearest point on the 1875 meander line.

F. R. No. 223

From Angle Point No. 1, Sec. 8, T. 5 S., R. 14 W., F. R. 223 bears N. 32° 39' E., 316.0 ft. dist. This well is in the river bed southeast of Lot 2, Sec. 8. The nearest point on the 1875 meander line bears N. 68° W., 58.3 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 225.

From Witness Post Mid-Point No. 2, F. R. 225 bears S. 3° 15' W., 482 ft. dist. This well is in the river bed southeast of Lot 2, Sec. 8, T. 5 S., R. 14 W. The nearest point on the 1875 meander line bears N. 68° W., 264 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 171

From Witness Post Mid-Point No. 4, F. R. 171 bears N. 50° 00' W., 350 ft. dist. This well is in the river bed south of the medial line. The nearest point on the medial line bears N. 20° 00' W., 225 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 168

From Witness Post Mid-Point No. 4, F. R. 168 bears N. 28° 57' W., 366 ft. dist. This well is in the river bed south of the medial

line. The nearest point on the medial line bears N. 29° 00′ W., 203 ft. dist.

F. R. No. 166.

From Witness Post Mid-Point No. 5, F. R. 163 bears N. 36° 00′ W., 554 ft. dist. This well is in the river bed south of the medial line. The nearest point on the medial line bears N. 29° 00′ W., 162 ft. dist.

As previously stated, it was found desirable to delineate the medial line on Map No. 2 of the survey of the boundary between the two States.

Five copies each of this report and map have been sent by registered mail to the Attorney General of the United States, the Attorney General of Texas, and the Attorney General of Oklahoma. Fifty copies have been filed with the clerk of the court for the use of such private interveners as may apply for them. Thirty additional copies of the report and map have been filed with the clerk for such disposition as the court may direct.

A statement of the time employed and the expense incurred in the medial line work will be the subject of later report.

Very respectfully,

ARTHUR D. KIDDER,
ARTHUR A. STILES,
Commissioners.

Washington, D. C., April 25, 1924.

United States and Cuban Allied Works Engineering Corporation,

Plaintiff in Error,

940. vs.

Lloyds, as Treasurer of Lloyds Underwriters Syndicate No. 601 et al.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York; transferred from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit pursuant to the Act of Congress of September 14th, 1922.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United Leather Workers' International Union No. 66 et al.,

Appellants,

233. vs.

Herkert & Meisel Trunk Company et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice McKenna,

Mr. Justice Van Devanter,

Mr. Justice Butler.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

The United States of America et al., Appellants, 228. vs. The Village of Hubbard, Ohio.

The United States of America et al., Appellants, 229. vs. The City of Wellsville, Ohio.

It is ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, restored to the docket and assigned for reargument on Monday, November 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

James K. Cochran and Harris Kobey, Plaintiffs in Error, 498. vs. Coulton M. Becker.

On consideration of the supplemental petition to revoke the mandate in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said supplemental petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Orinoco Company, Limited, et al., Appellants, 1018. vs. The Orinoco Iron Company.

On consideration of the motion to reinstate this cause on the docket,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel. Soo Hoo Hong, Petitioner, 454. vs. Robert E. Tod, Commissioner of Immigration etc.

On consideration of the suggestion to strike the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause from the docket,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, stricken from the docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel. Joseph Singleton, next friend of Lui Kah, 482. vs. Robert E. Tod, Commissioner of Immigration.

On consideration of the suggestion to strike the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause from the docket,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, stricken from the docket.

Edward H. Childs, Trustee in Bankruptcy,

Petitioner,

992. vs.

The United States of America.

On consideration of the suggestion to strike the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause from the docket,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, stricken from the docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Brooks-Scanlon Corporation,

Appellant,

367. vs.

The United States.

The United States, Appellant,

385. vs.

Brooks-Scanlon Corporation.

On consideration of the motion for leave to postpone the presentation of a petition for a rehearing herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Catherine G. Branan, Junior, an Infant etc.,

Petitioner,

1077. vs.

William A. Wimsatt, Trading as Johnson and Wimsatt.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, filed in manuscript, and of the brief presented by the petitioner in support of the same,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

It is further ordered that the motion of the petitioner for leave to proceed in forma pauperis and to have the record printed at public expense be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louisville Bedding Company,

Appellant,

1022. vs.

The United States.

On consideration of the motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims for further findings,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied without prejudice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United Gas & Electric Engineering Corporation, Appellant,
1060. vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims for further findings,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied without prejudice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Michigan, Complainant,
25, Original. vs.
The State of Wisconsin.

On consideration of the motion for the appointment of Conway Elder as Commissioner to take proofs herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

(*Insert p.672½).

Ex parte In the matter of Julius Shapiro and Samuel J. Smith, Individually and as Copartners, doing business as Shapiro & Smith, Bankrupts,
——, Original. Petitioners.

On consideration of the motion for a stay herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Sanitary District of Chicago, Appellant,
529. vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a brief herein on behalf of the States of Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Indiana, and Pennsylvania, as amici curiae,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cranberry Creek Coal Company, Plaintiff in Error,
900. vs.
The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Alliance Coal Mining Company, Plaintiff in Error,
901. vs.
The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The Lehigh Coal & Navigation Company, Plaintiff in Error,
902. vs.
The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday,

("Insert on preceding page

The State of Michigan, Complainant, vs. The State of Wisconsin. On consideration of the motion and stipulation for the appointment of a Special Commissioner to take proofs herein,

26, Orig'l.

It is now here ordered by this Court that Conway Elder, of St. Louis, Missouri, be, and he is hereby, appointed a Special Commissioner of this Court to take the proofs to be offered by the respective parties hereto, under the rules for practice for taking proofs upon reference to a Master, and to report such proofs to this Court, but without opinion thereon.

It is further ordered that said Commissioner may go from place to place and take such proofs at such convenient places as may seem necessary and proper in connection with the location, age and condition of the respective witnesses to be produced, and that said Commissioner have the power to employ a stenographer, and to administer oaths to the respective witnesses to be produced before him.

It is further ordered that in the taking of said proofs, at the request of either party hereto, that the said Commissioner may require such party to advance the reasonable expense for traveling to the designated place for taking the testimony, including stenographer's expenses.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

690

Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron Company,

Plaintiff in Error,

903. vs.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Company,

Appellant,

1076. vs.

Texas & Pacific Railway Company.

November 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Compagnie International de Produits Alimentaires, S. A.,

Appellant,

1061. vs.

Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 10th next, with No. 921, as one case.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robins Dry Dock & Repair Company,

Plaintiff in Error,

870. vs.

[illegible]es Dahl.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause placed on the summary docket and assigned for argument on Monday, November 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Palmer Brothers Company,

Appellant,

1050. vs.

D. B. Weaver, Chief of the Bureau of Inspection in Pittsburgh of the Department of Labor and Industry, etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fleischmann Construction Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States of America to the use of G. W. Forsberg et al.

979.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Twohy Brothers Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Clarence Kennedy.

1002.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Great International Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Plaintiff in Error, vs. J. W. Green.

738.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Reynolds-Davis Grocery Company.

891.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein

to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

R. H. Clemmer, Attorney in Fact etc., et al., Petitioners, vs. Arthur L. Ross et al.

1017.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Guardian Savings & Trust Company, Trustee, Petitioner, vs. Road Improvement District No. 7 of Poinsett County, Arkansas.

1029.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Great Northern Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Charles W. Reed et al.

1008.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein

to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Sherwin et al., Petitioners,
1012. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
1033. vs.
New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company,
Petitioner,
1065. vs.
Ernest J. Goneau.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of

counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Director General and Agent etc.,

Petitioner,

1071. vs.

John L. Roper Lumber Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian, et al.,

Petitioners,

1073. vs.

Benjamin Guinness et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Benjamin Guinness et al.,

Petitioners,

1074. vs.

Thomas W. Miller, as Alien Property Custodian, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein

to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago Great Western Railway Company. Petitioner,
1075. vs.
A. D. Schendel, Special Administrator etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the record already on file as an exhibit to the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. E. Williams et al., Petitioners,
751. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

North Pacific Steamship Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
973. vs.
William T. Soley.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Petitioner,
974. vs.
Anna W. Gill, Administratrix etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

S. H. Pomeroy Company et al., Petitioners,
1009. vs.
Frank F. Smith Hardware Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Emile Vital et al., etc., Copartners etc., Petitioners,
1010. vs.
Henry F. Kerr, Trading as the Kerr Steamship Line.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Isaac J. Bigio, Petitioner,

1011. vs.

Henry F. Kerr, Trading as the Kerr Steamship Line.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Merriam & Millard Company,

Petitioner,

1021. vs.

Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Elmyr A. Laughlin et al.,

Petitioners,

1024. vs.

Burry Railway Supply Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George W. Reed et al., Trustees,

1025. vs.

Federal Finance Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and

of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago Pneumatic Tool Company,
Petitioner,
1027. vs.
William H. Keller, Inc., formerly known as Keller Pneumatic Tool Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Rudolph DeMarco, Petitioner,
1035. vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Herman Wolff et al., Executors of the Will of Albert J. A. Hamilton,
Petitioner,
1046. vs.
John G. Williams.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Samuel S. Lewis et al., Petitioners,
1000. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mrs. F. W. Leatherbury, Community Administratrix, Petitioner,
1001. vs.
Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Third Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Third Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Leda K. Mayfield, Petitioner,
1015. vs.
The Equitable Trust Company of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Leda K. Mayfield, Petitioner,
1016. vs.
The Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to

the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fred S. Hoback, Petitioner,
1030. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Central Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
1034. vs.
Mrs. G. W. Sims.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Diamond Coal & Coke Company,
Petitioner,
1039. vs.
Hazelwood Dock Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Diamond Coal & Coke Company,
Petitioner,
1040. vs.
Hazelwood Dock Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Creosote Works, Inc., et al., Petitioners,
1041. vs.
Edwin L. Powell.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Landers Company, Inc., et al.,
Petitioners,
1049. vs.
Lincoln-Alliance Bank.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Commercial National Bank of Hutchinson, Kansas,
Petitioner,
1054. vs.
Heid Brothers, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Eighth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Eighth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Irving National Bank, etc.,
Petitioner,
1062. vs.
Thomas M. Blake et al.,Receivers.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United Stat[illegible] Circuit Court of Appeals for the [illegible] Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certa[illegible] herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circ[illegible] and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petiti[illegible] be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Forestglen Land Company,
Petitioner,
1065. vs.
George R. Scrugham et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joe R. Irwin, Petitioner,
1066. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

J. G. White & Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
1069. vs.
Ball Engineering Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. W. Wilkinson, Trustee,
Petitioner,
1079. vs.
J. L. Walker.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Agent,
899. vs.
L. L. Cohen & Company, Inc.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

B. F. Lee et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
905. vs.
Osceola & Little River Road Improvement District No. 1 of Mississippi County, Arkansas.

It is ordered by this Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the writ of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

ORDER. It is ordered by this Court that Sections 1 and 9 of Rule 26 of this Court be, and the same are hereby, amended so that said Sections shall, respectively, read as follows:

"1. The Court, on the first day of each Term, will commence calling the cases for argument in the order in which they stand on the docket, and proceed from day to day during the Term in the same order (except as hereinafter provided); and, if the parties, or either of them, shall be ready when the case is called, the same will be heard; and if neither party shall be ready to proceed in the argument, the case shall be continued to the next Term of the Court unless the Court shall otherwise order.

"9. If, after a case has been continued under Section 1, both parties shall desire to have it heard at the same Term, they may, not later than three days before a regular motion day, file with the Clerk their joint request to that effect accompanied by their affidavits or those of their counsel giving the reasons why the case was continued and why it should be reinstated. Reinstatement shall be made by the Court only when it appears to the Court that there was good reason for the previous continuance and that the reinstatement can be made without prejudice to the parties in other cases coming on regularly for hearing."

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

ORDER. It is ordered by this Court that in the cases in which opinions have been handed down today, ten days shall elapse before the mandates go down; and leave is given to the parties to file such motions within that period as they may be advised, which shall have the same effect as if filed this day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, as Agent etc.,
Petitioner,
114. vs.
Portland Seed Company.

San Francisco & Portland Steamship Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
122. vs.
A. J. Parrington.

James C. Davis, Agent, United States Railroad Administration,
Plaintiff in Error,
123. vs.
A. J. Parrington.

The motion for an extension of time within which to file petitions for rehearing herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hugh B. Rowland in that behalf; and the motion was denied.

The United States of America,

Petitioner,

559. vs.

Ninety-five Barrels, more or less, alleged Apple Cider Vinegar, et al.

On motion of Mr. L. C. Speith in that behalf, leave was granted to file a petition for rehearing herein within ten days.

ORDER. It is ordered by this Court that all cases on the docket not decided, and all other business of the Term not disposed of, be, and the same are hereby, continued to the next Term.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned to the time and place appointed by Law.

-ooo-